CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 7, 1921. ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Francis M. Goodwin.

DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS.

William M. Steuart.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

John Kelsey Jones, at Harrison, Ark.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEY.

Willis W. Moore, at Harrison, Ark.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

To be major generals.

William Gray Price, jr. Avery Delano Andrews.

To be brigadier generals.

William Ruthven Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, Dwight Edward Aultman, Field Artillery. Johnson Hagood, Coast Artillery Corps. Dennis Edward Nolan, Infantry. William Durward Connor, Corps of Engineers. Fox Conner, Field Artillery. Preston Brown, Infantry. Malin Craig, Cavalry. Henry Davis Todd, jr., Coast Artillery Corps. Albert Jesse Bowley, Field Artillery. William Hartshorne Johnston, Infantry. Robert Alexander, Infantry.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be captains.

Charles Fremont Snell, Jaime Julian Figueras.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be first lieutenant.

John Lawrence Hanley.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be captain.

George Anthony Horkan.

To be first lieutenant.

Everett Roscoe Stevens.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be captain.

Edward Elliott MacMorland.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

MARINE CORPS.

To be captain.

Arthur H. Turner.

To be first lieutenants.

Thomas E. Kendrick.

Kenneth O. Cuttle.

To be second lieutenants.

Karl F. Umlor. Thomas McK. Schuler. Marvin V. Yandle. Warren Sessions.

Leo Healey.

POSTMASTERS.

DELAWARE.

Richard F. McClure, Claymont.

MAINE.

Pearl Danforth, Castine. Joseph C. A. Daigenault, Jackman Station, George M. Jackson, Millbridge.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William J. Williams, Great Barrington, Charles A. Kimball, Littleton, Harry T. Johnson, Medway. Edgar A. Craig, North Easton.

NEBRASKA.

Henry Eichelberger, Crete.
Lewis A. Meinzer, Falls City.
Ernest W. Clift, Humboldt.
Edward B. Jameson, Lakeside.
Luther J. Saylor, Rising City.
Isaac L. Pindell, Sidney.

SENATE.

MONDAY, May 9, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following

Our Father, we thank Thee for the sunlight of the morning. Grant that our hearts may be filled with light and life and joy. and enter upon the duties awaiting us with the consciousness of Thy smile upon us, and that we want to walk along the pathway of duty with Thy direction and under Thy guidance. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY, a Senator from the State of Michigan, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. Curtis and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NEW. I desire to present and have printed in the RECORD a copy of a concurrent resolution adopted by the Indiana Legislature, on behalf of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, in approval of a plan to make the St. Lawrence River navigable for ocean-going vessels.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce,

as follows:

concurrent resolution approving the action of the governor in advancing the undertaking for a deep waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean.

Whereas it is proposed to make such improvements in the St. Lawrence River as to make the Great Lakes accessible to ocean-going commerce, and as this improvement will in effect bring the State of Indiana hundreds of miles nearer the world's markets, and as there are within the State great resources that lie wholly undeveloped while the production of all things is diminished or retarded by distance from markets, and because our producers and the consuming public have alike suffered enormous losses in the last three years by transportation shortage and failure; and because by reason of these conditions the transportation situation constitutes an emergency need, and as a number of States have joined in the Great Lakes-St. Lewrence Tidewater Association, having as its object the early undertaking and completion of this improvement: Therefore be it

completion of this improvement: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring).

That the State of Indiana is properly associated in the above-named organization with its neighboring Commonwealths in pressing to advance this undertaking, and that the action of the governor in so declaring is hereby approved and confirmed by the participation of this State, by the governor and those who represent him in the council of these States, is approved.

SEC. 2. That the representatives of this State in Congress of the United States be requested to facilitate and expedite in every way possible the prosecution of this undertaking for the economic freedom of a land-locked continent.

NOTE.—The above resolution was passed in Indiana Senate and House March 1, 1921.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association desire it entered on the Senate's record in Washington.

Yours, truly,

C. H. Comstock, Secretary.

C. H. COMSTOCK, Secretary.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., May 5, 1921.

Mr. COLT presented a memorandum from Rev. M. Zalitach, sundry citizens, and sundry organizations of Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, in relation to the case of East Galicia, requesting that the Government of the United States recognize guesting that the Government of the United States recognize East Galicia, along with northern Bukovina, as an independent state, the west Ukrainian republic; that the Government of the United States recognize the lawful government of the west Ukrainian republic, namely, the government established by the Ukrainian national assembly under the leadership of Dr. Eugene Petrushevich; and that the Government of the United States, as one of the temporary sovereigns of East Galicia, demand of Poland that she immediately evacuate East Galicia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution of the Lorain County Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Elyria, Ohio, favoring the reduction of armaments, which was referred to the Com-

mittee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented resolutions of the Optimist Club of Columbus and the Chamber of Commerce of Toledo, both in the State of Ohlo, praying for the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

FEDERAL LIVE-STOCK COMMISSION.

Mr. NORRIS. By direction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report back favorably with several amendments the bill (S. 659) to create a Federal live-stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 39) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the

calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 1670) for the relief of Buffkin & Girvin; and . A bill (S. 1671) for the relief of Edward B. Eppes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (S. 1672) for the appointment of William Edward Tidwell as first lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1673) to authorize interstate cooperative asssocia-

A bill (S. 1674) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1675) to confer upon the Territorial courts of the Territory of Hawaii jurisdiction concurrent with the United States courts of that district of all offenses under the act of October 28, 1919, known as the national prohibition enforcement

act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 1676) granting a pension to James H. Osburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 1677) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry D. Geddings; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1678) for the relief of Edith B. Macon; to the

Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1679) regulating the production of wares which enter into interstate commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 1680) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town

of Winchester, in the State of New Hampshire;
A bill (S. 1681) to donate a captured German cannon to the

city of Somersworth, N. H.; A bill (S. 1682) to donate a captured German gun to the Gordon-Bissell Post of the American Legion, located at Keene,

A bill (S. 1683) to donate a gun or howitzer to the city of Portsmouth, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 1684) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town of Plaistow, in the State of New Hampshire;
A bill (S. 1685) to donate a gun or howitzer to the city of

Dover, in the State of New Hampshire;
A bill (S. 1686) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town of Claremont, in the State of New Hampshire; A bill (S. 1687) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town of

Bennington, in the State of New Hampshire; A bill (S. 1688) to donate a gun or howitzer to the town of Littleton, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 1689) to donate a gun or howitzer to W. I. Brown Post, No. 31, Grand Army of the Republic, of Penacook, N. H.; A bill (S. 1690) to correct the military record of John Sulli-

A bill (S. 1691) to correct the military record of Samuel C.

A bill (S. 1692) to correct the military record of Francis E.

Barney (with accompanying papers);
A bill S. 1693) to correct the military record of William N.

Buck; to the Committee on Military Affairs. A bill (S. 1694) granting a pension to Ursulia S. Dinsmore; A bill (S. 1695) granting an increase of pension to Nellie A.

Sanborn:

A bill (S. 1696) granting a pension to Florence E. Thornburgh;

A bill (S. 1697) granting a pension to Grace P. Carter;

A bill (S. 1698) granting a pension to Charles Edward Stevens

A bill (S. 1699) granting an increase of pension to John A. Laughton:

A bill (S. 1700) granting a pension to Rufus E. Bean; A bill (S. 1701) granting an increase of pension to Joseph

A bill (S. 1702) granting an increase of pension to John W.

Fletcher;
A bill (S. 1703) granting a pension to Dennis Ring (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1704) granting a pension to Harriet A. Savage;

A bill (S. 1705) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Webber (with accompanying papers)

A bill (S. 1706) granting a pension to Henry Carroll; and A bill (S. 1707) granting an increase of pension to Matthias V. Bridges; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 1708) granting a pension to Annie M. B. Halsey;

A bill (S. 1709) granting a pension to Mary H. Shupe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 1710) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870 (16 Stat, L., p. 670), authorizing the Postmaster General to continue to use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand-stamp patents, and directing him to "determine upon a fair, just, and equitable compensation for the use of said inventions" or arising otherwise; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 54) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION RILL.

Mr. McLEAN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was, on page 51, line 25, after the word "That," to insert "with the exception of submarine torpedo boats," so as to read: "Total increase of the Navy heretofore authorized, \$90,000,000: Provided, That, with the exception of submarine torpedo boats, no part of this appropriation can be expended except on vessels now being constructed," which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO EMERGENCY TARIFF BILL,

Mr. TRAMMELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by hinr to House bill 2435, the emergency tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2435, the emergency tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PACIFIC COAST PETROLEUM INDUSTRY.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The report of the Federal Trade Commission, Part I, made pursuant to Senate resolution No. 138, is lying on the table. I move that it be printed as a public document.

The motion was agreed to.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed, and the calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on to-morrow upon the convening of the Senate, or as soon thereafter as the business of the Senate will permit, I desire to submit some observations on the pending emergency tariff bill.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES-OPEN EXECUTIVE SESSIONS.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, some days ago I gave notice under the Standing Rules of the Senate that I would call up for the consideration of the Senate a resolution proposing to change Rules XXXVII and XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, touching the closed executive sessions of the Senate, and providing that in the future there should be open executive sessions of the Senate in the consideration of presidential nominations and in the consideration of treaties, the only exception being when two-thirds of the Senators present concurring should vote for closed executive sessions of the Senate.

In pursuance of that notice I offer the following resolution

and ask for its immediate consideration:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read. The resolution (S. Res. 73) was read, as follows:

The resolution (S. Res. 73) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That clause 3 of Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended so as to read as follows:

"3. Unless, by the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present, it is agreed to consider a treaty in executive session, all treaties shall be considered and acted upon by the Senate in open executive session."

Resolved further, That clause 2 of Rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended so as to read as follows:

"2. All information communicated or remarks made by a Senator when acting upon nominations in executive session concerning the character or qualifications of the person nominated, also all votes upon any such nomination, shall be kept secret. If, however, charges shall be made against a person nominated, the committee may, in its discretion, notify such nominee thereof, but the name of the person making such charges shall not be disclosed. The fact that a nomination has been made, or that it has been confirmed or rejected, shall not be regarded as a secret."

Resolved further, That Rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be further amended by adding at the end thereof a new clause, as follow

"7. Unless, by the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present, it is agreed to consider a nomination made by the President in executive session, all nominations shall be considered and acted upon by the Senate in open executive session."

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll. The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harreld	McNary	Simmons
Bornh	Harris	Moses	Smith
Bronssard	Harrison	Nelson	Smoot
Bursum	Heflin	New	Spencer
Cameron	Johnson	Newberry	Stanfield
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Stanley
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Kellogg	Oddie	Sutherland
Culberson	Kendrick	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Kenyon	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Dillingham	Knox	Poindexter	Warren
Ernst	La Follette	Ransdell	Watson, Ga.
Fernald	Lodge	Reed	Watson, Ind.
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Robinson	Williams
Glass	McKellar	Sheppard	Willis
Gooding	McKinley	Shields	Wolcott
Halo	McLoon	Shortridge	

Mr. TRAMMELL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. Fletcher] is necessarily detained on committee business. Mr. HEFLIN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. Underwood] is necessarily absent on account of a death in his

family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day. The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators having an-

swered to their names, a quorum is present. Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, what is the request of the Sen-

ator from Mississippi?

Mr. HARRISON. I have moved the immediate consideration of the resolution proposing to amend the rules in accordance with the notice heretofore given by me.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, this is Calendar Monday, and

I must insist upon the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order, and the first bill on the calendar will be stated.

THE CALENDAR.

The bill (S. 656) to create a bureau of aeronautics in the

Department of the Navy was announced as first in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that that bill may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will go over. The bill (S. 1021) to provide for the exchange of Government lands for privately owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii was announced as next in order.

Mr. KENYON. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

MARIVELES QUARRY, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 23) authorizing the Secretary of War to investigate the claims of private parties to the Mariveles quarry within the limits of a United States military reservation in the Philippine Islands, and to permit the working thereof by the persons entitled thereto, provided military necessities permit, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to make or cause to be made such inquiry and investigation into any equitable claims of such private parties in and to the stone quarries at Mariveles, Province of Bataan, in the Philippine Islands, within the limits of the United States military reservation as set aside by the President of the United States in Executive order of June 7, 1904, as may have filed claims with the War Department, or in other offices under its jurisdiction, and to permit the resumption of private operations therein by license or otherwise and to the extent that he may consider such claims of such parties entitle them to, with due regard to military necessities: Provided, however, That nothing herein authorized shall be deemed to remove the site of said quarry from the jurisdiction and control of the military authorities of the United States under and by virtue of the reservation made by the President as aforesaid.

Mr. HONES of Washington, Mr. President I scaled activative.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I could not catch from the reading of the joint resolution what authority is proposed to be given to the Secretary of War to render a judgment or a decision. If any member of the Military Affairs Committee can give me any information in reference to that matter, I should like to have it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, it appears that when the United States Government took possession of the Philippine Islands it also took possession of the lands upon which certain quarries were being operated. Those quarries have been regarded by the military authorities as necessary for military

They were prior to American occupation of the islands used as the principal source of building material for the city of Manila. It now, however, appears that similar material has been discovered in abundant quantities, and that there is no reason why the quarries should not be operated for commercial purposes and the output used in the construction of buildings in the city of Manila. For that reason the Secretary of War is authorized by the joint resolution to permit the former owners of the quarries to resume their operation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The title of the joint resolution authorizes the Secretary of War to investigate the claims of private parties. What I wanted to learn was whether it authorized him to reach a conclusion, to pass on those claims, to determine the rights of the owners, and so forth; and if so, how far his action would bind the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON. The joint resolution is brief, and, as suggested by the Senator from Washington, its title is not very clear as to the authority which is proposed to be conferred on the Secretary of War. Under the joint resolution the Secretary

of War is-

empowered to make or cause to be made such inquiry and investigation into any equitable claims of such private parties in and to the stone quarries at Mariveles, Province of Bataan, in the Philippine Islands, within the limits of the United States military reservation as set aside by the President of the United States military reservation as set aside by the President of the United States in Executive order of June 7, 1904, as may have filed claims with the War Department, or in other offices under its jurisdiction, and to permit the resumption of private operations therein by license or otherwise and to the extent that he may consider such claims of such parties entitle them to, with due regard to military necessities: Provided, however, That nothing herein authorized shall be deemed to remove the site of said quarry from the jurisdiction and control of the military authorities of the United States under and by virtue of the reservation made by the President as aforesaid.

The sole purpose and effect of the joint resolution are to permit the parties who privately owned and operated the quarries prior to the military occupation of the islands by the United States to resume the possession of their property and their operation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As I understand, the Secretary of War is to examine the equitable claims of these private

parties?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then, what can be do after he makes the examination? What report is he to make?

Mr. ROBINSON. The joint resolution gives him the power to permit the owners, if he finds their claims are sustained, to resume the operation of their quarries. That is the purpose of the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Is that the sole purpose of the joint resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes. I think the joint resolution once before passed the Senate. It was then presented to the committee by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who was chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs at the time the United States Government took possession of the islands, and the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming to the Committee on Military Affairs made a very clear case that the joint resolution ought to pass.

In 1898, or about that time, owners were operating their narries. They then passed into the control of the United quarries. States, and since that time the former owners have not been permitted to operate the quarries, the Government taking the position that the product of those quarries would be necessary for military purposes. Since that time, however, and compara-tively recently, as I stated a moment ago, an abundance of building material has been found, and there is now no reason known to the Committee on Military Affairs, and no reason that suggests itself to me at this time, why the passage of this joint resolution would not be an act of justice to the parties who formerly claimed the property and operated it.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without

amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUITS IN FORMA PAUPERIS.

The bill (S. 426) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1, chapter 209, of the United States Statutes at Large, volume 27, entitled 'An act providing when plaintiff may sue as a poor person and when counsel shall be assigned by the court,' and to provide for the prosecution of writs of error and appeals in forma pauperis, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 866) was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to amend section 1, chapter 200, of the United States Statutes at Large, volume 27, entitled 'An act providing when plaintiff may sue as a poor person and when counsel shall be assigned by the court,' and to provide for the prosecu-

tion of writs of error and appeals in forma pauperis, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 866), be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That any citizen of the United States entitled to commence any suit or action, civil or criminal, in any court of the United States may, upon the order of the court, commence and prosecute or defend to conclusion any suit or action, or a writ of error or an appeal to the circuit court of appeals, or to the Supreme Court in such suit or action, including all appellate proceedings, unless the trial court shall certify in writing that in the opinion of the court such appeal or writ of error is not taken in good faith, without being required to prepay fees or costs or for the printing of the record in the appellate court or give security therefor, before or after bringing suit or action, or upon suing out a writ of error or appealing, upon filing in said court a statement under oath in writing that because of his poverty he is unable to pay the costs of said suit or action or of such writ of error or appeal, or to give security for the same, and that he believes that he is entitled to the redress he seeks in such suit or action or writ of error or appeal, and setting forth briefly the nature of his alleged cause of action or appeal: Provided, That in any criminal case the court may, upon the filing in said court of the affidavit hereinbefore mentioned, direct that the expense of printing the record on appeal or writ of error be paid by the United States, and the same shall be paid when authorized by the Attorney General."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to ask

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Nelson] what particular change the bill makes in the present statute. There is nothing in the reading of the bill to indicate the change which has been made.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, under the existing statute where a man has a meritorious case but is poor and without means the court may authorize him to sue in forma pauperis, as it is called in the old law Latin; that is, he may sue and the court will bear the expense. The rule of the court requires that when a case is appealed to the Supreme Court the record shall be printed, and the only change in existing law is the proviso at the end of the bill which authorizes the court to pay the expense of printing the record. That is the only change.

Mr. KENYON. The bill applies only to criminal cases?

Mr. NELSON. It only applies to criminal cases. I may add that the bill is recommended by the Department of Justice, and I think a similar bill was passed at the last session of

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLOSING OF UPPER WATER STREET, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (S. 813) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close upper Water Street between Twentyfirst and Twenty-second Streets NW., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close upper Water Street between Twenty-first and Twenty-second Streets NW., lying between Potomac Park and square 88, provided that the consent in writing of the owners of all private property in square 88 is first had and obtained; and upon the closing of the street between tween the limits named the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to transfer the land contained in the bed of the street to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 384) to require judges appointed under authority of the United States to devote their entire time to the duties of a judge was announced as next in order.

Mr. KENYON. Let that bill go over. The VICE PRESIDENT. Under objection, it will go over.

STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

The bill (S. 52) for the relief of the Stevens Institute of Technology, of Hoboken, N. J., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to the trustees of the Stevens Institute of Technology, of Hoboken, N. J., \$45,750, being the sum paid to the United States January 28, 1870, as a collateral inheritance tax upon the bequest which provided for the establishment and endowment of the institute.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time,

REIMBURSEMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS FOR CIVIL-WAR EXPENDITURES.

The bill (S. 546) making an appropriation to pay the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred and paid, at the request of the President, in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast during the Civil War, in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims and Senate Report No. 764, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the governor of the State of Massachusetts, or his duly authorized

agent, \$233,885.82, being the costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by such State for interest and premium paid for coin in payment of such interest on bonds issued for money borrowed and expended at the request of the President of the United States during the Civil War in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast, the accounting officers of the Treasury having found that the expenditures were so incurred and paid by the State; and which the Court of Claims in its report to Congress under the act approved July 16, 1916, as set forth in Document No. 369, House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, also found had been so incurred and paid.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM R. LANCASTER.

The bill (S. 472) for the relief of William B. Lancaster was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to William B. Lancaster, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, in full compensation for injuries received while employed by the Reclamation Service at the west portal, Strawberry Tunnel, Strawberry Valley project, Utah.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] give us an explanation of this bill? I think it is one that he introduced.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall be glad to do so, although the chairman of the committee is here.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I reported that bill, and I

shall be glad to make a statement about it.

Lancaster was working as a teamster at a rock quarry operated by the Government during the war. Through no fault of Lancaster, a large amount of refuse from the plant, including earth, became deposited on the roof of the building. Lancaster was working under the roof as a teamster the roof was crushed in and Lancaster was very seriously injured. His injuries are pitiable. His suffering has been almost unlimited. He will never recover. A photograph of Lancaster as he appeared some years ago, when in the Army of the United States, was presented to the committee, with photographs of him as he appears now. A statement by Lancaster is also printed in the record.

There has never come under my observation a more pathetic case than that now under consideration. Lancaster was comcase than that now under consideration. Lancaster was compelled to remain in the hospital for a very long period. The Government paid him what was the equivalent of a year's salary, but that was entirely consumed in the payment of his hospital expenses, so that as the result of the general compensation law now in force he has had a part of his expenses paid while he was suffering in the hospital, but has had absolutely nothing for compensation. The committee was unanimously of the opinion that this bill ought to pass.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say also to the Senator from Iowa that after the year's salary was paid for Mr. Lancaster's care in the hospital he then had to find friends to give him money to continue his hospital treatment. I never in my life saw a human being alive and moving about in such condition as Mr. Lancaster is to-day. He is in a horrible condition. He is suffering to-day and will suffer all his life; and this \$5,000 is merely to try to pay the expenses he has incurred up to the present time, with perhaps a little to help him on, because he can not live very much longer.

Mr. KENYON. I was not objecting to the bill; I merely wanted to know about it. It is evidently a meritorious measure

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGNES INGELS, DECEASED.

The bill (S. 1300) for the relief of the heirs of Agnes Ingels, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the heirs of Agnes Ingels, deceased, late of Lexington, Ky., the sum of \$5,000 for injuries occasioned to the said Agnes Ingels while a visitor at Hot Springs, Ark., by the negligent operation of United States Government motor truck No. 25967 while said truck was in the care and custody of and being driven

by an enlisted man of the United States Army under the orders of his superior officer, and while the use of such truck was dangerous because of its defective condition, such condition being known to the officer responsible for the maintenance of said truck in operation, the injuries occasioned as aforesaid resulting in the death of said Agnes Ingels,

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF THE JUDICIAL CODE.

The bill (S. 214) to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

The reading clerk read the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, perhaps I should explain this bill. It passed the Senate at the last session. Most of what has been read is the law now. It changes it only in this respect:

As the law is now, if a man has a claim of over \$10,000 against the Government, if he lives in Iowa, or no matter where he lives, he has to come to Washington and employ a Washington lawyer. He has to go before a court that has no jury. This bill extends the jurisdiction so that the courts may have jurisdiction of claims amounting to as much as \$50,000. The bill says \$100,000, but the committee has prepared an amendment making it \$50,000, so that if a man outside of Washington has a claim against the Government he has a right to sue in his own bailiwick and have a jury of his own peers.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, let that bill go over. There is no report filed on it, and I should like to run through it and examine it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an objection, and the bill will be passed over.

JAMES DUFFY.

The bill (8, 723) for the relief of James Duffy was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and the laws conferring rights and privileges upon honorably discharged soldiers, their widows and dependent relatives, James Duffy, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of the above organization on the 6th day of October, 1862: Provided, That no pay, pension, bounty, or other emoluments shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HENRY J. DAVIS.

The bill (S. 724) for the relief of Henry J. Davis was an-

nounced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ORION MATHEWS.

The bill (S. 725) for the relief of Orion Mathews was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PAYMENTS FROM LUMP-SUM APPROPRIATIONS.

The bill (S. 581) to repeal the act prohibiting increased pay under lump-sum appropriations to employees transferred within one year was announced as next in order.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to ask my friend from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] to let that bill and the next one go over until he can get further along in the framing of his classification bill. They are matters that we will consider and act upon, but I do not think we should make the repeal at this time; so I object to the consideration of the bills.

Mr. STERLING. That is agreeable to me.
The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate bill 581 and Senate bill 582 will be passed over.

The bill (S. 158) for the relief of certain estates was announced as next in order.

The reading clerk read the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not see the chairman of the committee in the Chamber. I therefore ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

REUBEN R. HUNTER.

The bill (S. 906) for the relief of Reuben R. Hunter was announced as next in order.

The reading clerk read the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have a direct appropriation made for this purpose rather than have the bill likely when the next unit is opened the returned soldiers will

pass as reported. It seems to me that in a case of this kind we ought to make a direct appropriation, and then we will know what amount will be paid.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Ir. President, the bill which was introduced in the last Congress did provide for a lump appropriation; but the Committee on Claims considered the whole subject, and at the suggestion of that committee it was changed to a monthly allowance instead of a lump sum. should have been quite willing to have a lump sum provided for in the bill, but the Committee on Claims was apparently unanimous in the belief that this man ought to be put in the same position as an injured Federal employed

The Senator from Utah doubtless will recall that in this case Mr. Hunter as a private citizen, not in the employ of the Government, participated in putting out a forest fire, and while

so doing lost both his eyes.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I remember the case very well, and we have just passed a bill for a man named Lancaster whom we gave \$5,000. He certainly is in a horrible condition. like to prepare an amendment to this bill giving Mr. Hunter a direct appropriation; and for that reason, and that only, I shall ask that the bill go over for the day. I have not the amendment prepared or I would offer it at this time.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The chairman of the Committee on Claims is present, and I am sure the committee has fully considered that question. I am only fearful that if we let the matter be changed and make a lump-sum appropriation for this man's benefit a delay will result, and we may not be able to get the bill through the other House.

Mr. SMOOT. I assure the Senator that I shall have the amendment in next Monday, when the calendar comes up again.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. At any rate, I should like to

ask the chairman of the Committee on Claims a question as to the general policy of that committee regarding such relief measures

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think any definite plan has been agreed upon, for we have just passed two bills of a similar character here and they were lump-sum bills.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I observed that that had been done, and I was just wondering whether there had been any change in the policy of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill may go over to-day, and I assure the Senator that I will have the amendment ready by next Monday.

PREFERENCE RIGHTS TO EX-SERVICE MEN.

The bill (S. 594) for the relief of certain ex-service men whose rights to make entries on the North Platte irrigation project, Nebraska-Wyoming, were defeated by intervening claims was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as fol-

lows:

Be it enacted, cie., That the ex-service men qualified to make entry under the homestead laws, who were successful at the drawing held March 5, 1920, for farm units on the North Platte irrigation project, Fort Laramie unit, Nebraska-Wyoming, and to whom approved water-rental applications were duly issued, but who were prevented from making homestead entries for the lands covered by such applications because of the reinstatement of certain conflicting homestead entries, shall each have a preferred right of entry under the homestead laws at the next opening of lands under said project, for not less than 30 days before the date set for the opening of such lands to other entries: Provided, That this act shall not be considered as entiting any person to make another homestead entry who shall have received the benefits of the homestead laws since being prevented, as aforesaid, from exercising the right acquired at the said drawing on March 5, 1920.

Mr. PITTIMAN. Mr. President I would like to ask the Sen-

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge how many men this applies to?
Mr. WARREN. To two men.

Mr. PITTMAN. If I recollect correctly, I opposed the bill in the committee

Mr. WARREN. I think there were originally 13 or 14 men asking for relief, and the department was able to arrange exchange and settlement with all but two. Those men were of the World War service and were entitled to preference, with others, and exercised their rights. They got their certificates and paid their money. In the meantime the Douglas, Wyo., land office raked up some later report showing that they had allowed this same property to go to other parties. So they are without the use of their homestead rights, and their money is gone. This bill simply provides that they can go to the next reclamation unit which is opened and get what they lost in this one in way of their homestead rights.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understand that the bill not only provides that they can go to the next unit but it provides that they shall

have a preference right in the next unit.

Mr. WARREN. They had 60 days in which to file in the drawing on this unit we are speaking of—the Nebraska-Wyoming unit. This proposed bill cuts them down to 30 days. Quite

do as they did before—that is, exercise their preference rights in order that they may get desirable homesteads. Of course, they could not exercise their homestead rights while they were abroad.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill merely places the two men in the same position they were in before. They had a preference right in the drawing in this unit.

Mr. WARREN. They are out \$500 apiece. The Government has their money and they have nothing to show for it.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is perfectly fair that these men should have something. The question is as to whether it is fair as against another group of men who will draw on an entirely

Mr. WARREN. But these two men did have their rights, and they pursued the course indicated for them. The fault is entirely with the Government. The Government has taken their money and their settlement rights. The bill gives them 30 days in which to file in a new drawing.

Mr. PITTMAN. How many applications were made at that drawing?

Mr. WARREN. I do not remember, but some thousands

Mr. SMOOT. There were some 12 soldiers who had the preference right. Ten were taken care of, and the report of the Secretary of the Interior gives exactly the reasons why these two men were not. It was through no fault of their own.

two men were not. It was through no fault of their own.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understand it was because the land they
drew was not open to withdrawal.

Mr. WARREN. The department itself is asking for this relief. The bill was drawn in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PITTMAN. As I understand it, there were over a thousand men seeking locations on those three units. It happened that of those who could get in on this project two drew blanks; in other words, they drew land which was not open to drawing. But they are in exactly the same position as about a thousand others.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is entirely mistaken. Those who could not draw neither relinquished their homestead rights nor gave up their money. These two men relinquished their rights, and they paid their money for the water. We are simply giving back to them what makes them as nearly whole as possible because their loss was on account of a mistake of the Government itself through its agents.

Mr. PITTMAN. As I remember, in the committee all I insisted on, in which I was overruled, was that these men should be put in exactly the same position they were in before the drawing, and in exactly the same position a thousand other ex-soldiers were in who did not get in on that project, and that we should not give them a preference right over that thousand.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator certainly would not expect the Government to keep their money and give them no further right to a homestead.

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I want them to have their homestead rights restored, or I want their money given back to them; but I want them to have equal rights in the drawing with the next thousand who were excluded from this drawing. But I do not intend to object to the passage of the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PREFERENCE TO DISCHARGED SERVICE MEN.

The bill (S. 809) to give preference right of employment on construction work on United States reclamation projects, and preference right of entry on the public lands, to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That men and women who served in the Army or Navy of the United States in the war with Germany and have been honorably separated or discharged therefrom or placed in the Regular Army or Naval Reserve shall have preference in employment upon projects constructed by the United States Reclamation Service: Provided, That they are found to possess the capacity necessary for the proper discharge of such duties: Provided further. That the rights and benefits conferred by this act shall not extend to any person who having been drafted for service under the provisions of the selective service act shall have refused to render such service or to wear the uniform of such service of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask if the Senator from Utah is in charge of this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not in charge of the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I see the bill proposes to give preference to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines. The Senator from Utah is on the Finance Committee, which has had before it for eight or nine months a bill which passed the House of Representatives two sessions of Congress ago proposing to compensate soldiers, known as the adjusted compensation bill, or bonus bill. What is the status of that bill?

Mr. SMOOT. The bonus bill is now before the Finance Committee, and so far there have been no hearings held upon it at this session. I do not think there will be a necessity for any further hearings. I think the committee will report that bill to the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. When, may I ask? Mr. SMOOT. I can not tell exactly.

Mr. HARRISON. What is the Senator's best judgment

Mr. SMOOT. It depends on how soon we get through with the hearings on the revenue bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Nothing will be done, then, on this soldiers' bill, even though the Senator's opinion is that it will not be necessary to have any more hearings, until after the hearings are closed on the general tariff bill and after it has passed the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say that, and I do not want the Senator to take my answer as a positive statement. I was only expressing what I thought would follow. It may be reported to the Senate before those hearings are finished. The Finance Committee will meet every morning at 10.30, I suppose, for some weeks to come.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to pry into the secrets of the Finance Committee—

Mr. SMOOT. There are none.

Mr. HARRISON. No; I understand there are no secrets in any committee work; but has there been any motion made by anyone to bring that bill out during this session of Congress?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that committee have not as yet taken up their calendar for the consideration of any bills befor it at this session.

Mr. HARRISON. Then there has been no motion made to bring that bill out of committee?

Mr. SMOOT. There has not.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator will recall that about 10 days before the last Congress closed both the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Penrose], the chairman of the Committee on Finance, and his right bower, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCumber], told a delegation of soldiers representing the American Legion, who came here, that in all probability that bill would be reported out immediately, and would be passed before the session closed. The Senator recalls that?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not know what they told the representatives of the American Legion.

Mr. HARRISON. I am only quoting what I saw in the papers.

Mr. SMOOT. What the Senator sees in the papers is not always just the fact.

Mr. HARRISON. So the committee is not going to make good the suggestion of those distinguished members of the committee made to this delegation representing the American Legion?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not think the representatives of the American Legion are in any way, shape, or form alarmed over what the Senate Finance Committee is going to do. I think they have confidence in the committee. I say to the Senator that I am positive the bill will be reported to the Senate, and I have not the least doubt but that it will pass the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope they have confidence that the committee will bring out that legislation. I think they are about the only ones who have.

Mr. SMOOT. I am sorry for the Senator from Mississippi if he has not any confidence in that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate and open to further amendment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to give preference right of employment on construction work on United States reclamation projects to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines."

EXCHANGE OF ARMS AND EQUIPMENT.

The bill (S. 1574) authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange, with foreign nations desiring same, samples of arms and equipment in use by the Army of the United States was considered as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let that go over.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. The consideration of the calendar is completed.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS IN HAWAII.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I would like to know what became of Senate bill 1021, to provide for the exchange of Government lands for privately owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It went over on objection.

Mr. WARREN. Does the RECORD show who objected?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Ken-YON] objected.

Mr. WARREN. That Senator is not in the Chamber at this

PERSONAL EXPLANATION-LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, an incident occurred in the last campaign with which I was personally concerned and which has a certain public interest. I very much desire that at least my colleagues in the Senate should know the facts in chronological order as they actually occurred.

During this presidential campaign of 1920, while discussing before the people of Missouri the League of Nations and the relation of our country to its provisions, I said many times in effect that the undertaking of article 10 of the covenant, "to preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity of all States members of the league," meant just what it said, and that a concrete illustration of the effect of this obligation upon the United States was to be found in the statement which I alleged President Wilson had made at the eighth plenary session of the peace conference on May 31, 1919, when he declared that the peace of the world depended upon armed strength and led the delegates then present, and particularly the Rumanian delegates, to believe that if at any time in the future, their fortiforial boundary lines as established by the future their territorial boundary lines as established by the treaty of peace should become endangered an American Army and an American Navy would be sent to preserve the integrity of their territory, and I said in substance that this promise to send an American Army and an American Navy overseas was precisely the thing which the obligation of article 10 imposed and which the nations of Europe expected.

Mr. Joseph P. Tumulty, the then Secretary to the President, upon hearing of the statement which I was making, telegraphed

to the St. Louis Post Dispatch as follows:

The attention of the President has been called to a speech delivered in your State by Senator Spencer, in which he quoted the President as saying in a speech delivered to a delegation made up of Rumanians and Serbs in Paris that if any nation ever invaded their territory he would send the American Army across the seas to defend their boundary

The excerpt from the speech of Senator Spencer has been called directly to the President's attention, and he authorized me to say that Senator Spencer's statement is absolutely and unqualifiedly false.

I had then, as I confess I still have, a serious doubt as to whether at that time the attention of the President himself had ever been called to the statements which I was repeatedly making, but that the origin of the telegram which I have just quoted was entirely with Mr. Tumulty, and I made public, after reading Mr. Tumulty's telegram, the following statement:

reading Mr. Tumulty's telegram, the following statement:

No one familiar with conditions at Washington place any credence in the statement of Mr. J. P. Tumulty that the President himself has considered and denied what I have often said and what I expect to repeat again and again, and that is that the President, in his agreement, which he demands the American people shall, by "a solemn referendum," approve, has attempted to obligate this Nation to send its Army and Navy anywhere in the world where a boundary line is invaded, and that American soldiers shall "preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity of every member of the league" and in every part of the globe.

The President illustrated this pledge to the Rumanian delegates by assuring them that if the world was ever troubled again he would send an American Army and an American fleet.

It is significant that the first denial comes at this late date and from the President's private secretary, Mr. J. P. Tumulty, who dares, as he has again and again done in far more important matters, to speak in the voice of the President.

PROMISE MATTER OF RECORD.

PROMISE MATTER OF RECORD.

The promise of the President is a matter of record. It has been printed over and over again in the public press and never denied. In the issue of the Century Magazine for May it was expressly set out and severely criticized by that distinguished author, Mr. Herbert Adams Gibbons. It was declared in the Senate months before that and was never denied. There can be no doubt about the promise or the intention of the President to bind the United States without any qualification or exception to send its Army and Navy into every world trouble wherever an invasion of a boundary line occurred.

It is now for the first time denied by Mr. J. P. Tumulty in the vain hope of stemming the rising tide of universal opposition to any such un-American obligation.

The American people never will agree to it. The American soldiers who fought in the Great War repudiate it. The conscience of the country protests against it. It is far more important than any political affiliation, and the record of the President's agreement in article 10 of the treaty and his promise to the Rumanians in the official stenographic notes of the eighth plenary session, as I have stated it, are facts the whole world knows.

Doubtless the newspapers which were publishing the matter promptly notified Mr. Tumulty of this statement which I made, for I soon received the following telegram from Mr. Tumulty, which I did not answer:

which I did not answer:

The newspaper representatives have called my attention to a statement given by you to the St. Louis papers, containing the following quotation:

"I do not for a moment believe that the President ever made any such denial, or that the matter was ever called to his attention, as J. P. Tumulty indicates in his letter. Anyone who knows the situation at Washington knows that Mr. Tumulty is himself conducting the administration of government far more than the President of the United States, and has become accustomed to issue orders and make statements originating entirely in his own mind, but falsely announced as having back of them the knowledge and sanction of the President."

I shall not attempt to characterize the reflection upon the President himself which is found in this statement. I shall leave to your conscience to say whether you consider this statement as worthy of a Senator of the United States. The statement you make charging that I have falsely issued a denial at the White House that the President had promised military aid to the Rumanians and Serbs is one that I can not allow to pass without comment.

It is a fact that the President, in his own handwriting, authorized me to say that the alleged quotation from you contained in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch was false. If you doubt the authenticity of the President's authority, his written direction to me is on file at the White House, where either you or any representative you may appoint may examine it.

(Signed) J. P. Tumulty.

examine it.

(Signed) J. P. TUMULTY, Secretary to the President.

Very soon thereafter I received a telegram direct from President Wilson himself reading as follows: Senator SELDEN PALMER SPENCER,

St. Louis:

I have just been shown your statement that my secretary's denial of the previous statement by you that I had promised American military aid to Rumanians and Serbs was issued by him without my knowledge and sanction, and that you did not believe that I had made any such denial or that the matter was ever called to my attention by Mr. Tumulty, and that I requested him to issue the denial to which you

refer.
I reiterate the denial.
The statement you made was false.

WOODROW WILSON.

To this telegram I at once, on October 5, 1920, replied as follows:

ST. Louis, October 5.

White House, Washington, D. C .:

White House, Washington, D. C.:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of October 5, in which you deny that you promised American military aid to Rumanians and Serbs and that previous denial which Mr. J. P. Tumulty had made was at your request. The statement of yours to which I have often referred in my address was the statement in the stenographic notes of the eighth plenary session of the peace conference, in which you are reported to have said to Premier Bratiano of Rumania as follows:

"You must not forget that it is force that is the final guaranty of the public peace. If the world is again troubled, the United States will send to this side of the ocean their Army and their fleet."

This statement appeared in the issue of the Century Magazine for May, 1920, in an article by that distinguished writer, Mr. Herbert Adams Gibbons, who, I am informed, was attached to your own publicity department in Paris. It was made upon the floor of the Senate on February 2, 1920, by Senator Reed and, so far as I have learned, has never been denied until now. It has been widely circulated over the United States. If you did not make that statement to Premier Bratiano, I should be much indebted if you will be good enough to inform me. Bratiano, inform me.

I have, under date of April 11, 1921, received from the State Department in answer to my request a note in which the Secretary of State writes:

I send you herewith a copy of the statement by President Wilson on May 31, 1919, at the pienary session of the peace conference as set forth in the official report in English of the proceedings on that day.

The full and accurate text of what the President of the United States did say when speaking in English at the eighth plenary conference on May 31, 1919, I ask leave of the Senate to print in full as an appendix to my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is

granted.

Mr. SPENCER. The quotations from this official address which the President of the United States made, and which I desire to read, are as follows:

We must not close our eyes to the fact that in the last analysis the military and naval strength of the great powers will be the final guaranty of the peace of the world. * * * There underlies all these transactions the expectation on the part, for-example, of Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and of Serbia, that if any covenants of this settlement are not observed, the United States will send her armies and her navies to see that they are observed.

The version of what the President said as written in French is reported as follows. Both the original in French and a literal translation thereof reads:

If the world finds itself troubled anew, if the conditions which we all regard as fundamental are again drawn into question, the guaranty which is given to you will mean that the United States will send to this side of the ocean their Army and their Navy.

I ask leave to have the original in French, as it will support it, also inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Si le monde se trouve de nouveau troublé, si les conditions que nous regardons tous comme fondamentales, sont remises en question, la garantie qui vous est donnée a veut dire que les États-Unis feront passer de ce côté de l'océan leur armée et leur flotte.

Mr. SPENCER. After this controversy arose as to what President Wilson said it was reported to the American press by Premier Bratiano himself, who was present at the time President Wilson spoke, that the statement of the President was:

dent Wilson spoke, that the statement of the President was:

The allied and associated powers will guarantee to maintain as much as possible the just conditions to which they will have agreed. They take upon themselves this engagement and naturally upon them falls the principal responsibility.

It must not be forgotten that their force is the guaranty. The same argument applies to their authority. It is on the same basis that the minority States mentioned should understand that the principal powers will guarantee the very existence of these States.

Is it unjust that they agreed to this demand since conditions which we regard as fundamentally just are in question? The guaranty given to you amounts to this—that the United States will send from the other side of the ocean their Army and their fleet.

Mr. REED. Mr. President-

Mr. SPENCER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. REED. Was the statement just read made to the representatives of Rumania and Czechoslovakia? What is the Senator now quoting from?

Mr. SPENCER. The quotation which I have just made is a statement of Premier Bratiano himself as to what his notes show was said by the President of the United States at the eighth plenary conference.

On October 6, 1920, in evident reply to my telegram of October 5, the President wired me as follows:

Hon. SELDEN P. SPENCER, St. Louis:

I am perfectly content to leave it to the voters of Missouri to determine which of us is telling the truth. WOODROW WILSON.

To this telegram I replied as follows:

OCTOBER 6, 1920.

Your telegram of date has been repeated to me while campaigning in the State. There must be no misunderstanding about a matter of such great national importance as to whether you stated to Premier Bratiano, of Rumania, that an American Army and Navy would be sent across the sea in case the world is again troubled. It has been for months publicly asserted that such agreement on your part is incorporated in the stenographic reports of the eighth plenary session of the peace conference. I again beg of you to let me know whether such is the fact.

SELDEN P. SPENCER.

To this telegram I received no answer.

The last statement from the White House was on the following day, October 7, 1920, and I beg the Senate to bear in mind that date, and in my judgment its bearing upon the whole controversy is perhaps the most important of all the statements. It was printed generally throughout the country and reads as follows:

The contribution to-day from the White House in the controversy between President Wilson and Senator Spencer, of Missouri, who charged the President with having definitely promised the aid of the American Army and Navy to Rumania and Serbia at the peace conference, was a statement by Secretary Tumulty that the President has no stenographic report of the eighth plenary session, at which the promise is alleged to have been made, and that so far as the President knows there is no such record in this country.

The statement which the Missouri Senator has charged to President Wilson, and which is being used as part of the Republican campaign against the League of Nations, is said, according to various published reports, to have been made by the President at a session of the council of four on May 31, 1919. Mr. Spencer, however, referred to it as having been made at the eighth plenary session of the peace conference.

"President Wilson tells me there is no stenographic record of the proceedings of the conference in his possession," Mr. Tumulty said, "and so far as the President knows there is none in this country."

I did not at the time place any credence in the statement that

I did not at the time place any credence in the statement that there was no official copy in the hands of the President or accessible to him in the State Department containing a full account of what actually happened on May 31, 1919, and I recently requested of the State Department information in regard to this fact. Under date of April 15, 1921, I received a reply from the Secretary of State reading as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE, Washington, April 15, 1921.

Hon. Selden P. Spencer, United States Senate.

Mr Dear Senator Spencer: In answer to your letter of April 13, 1 beg to say that the records of the Department of State show that 500 copies of protocol No. S. in English, from which the extract sent to you with my letter of April 11 was taken, were sent by the peace commission to the Department of State on July 9, 1919, and were received by the department on July 22, 1919. Three hundred additional copies, also in English, were sent by the embassy at Paris on February 12, 1920, and received in the Department of State on March 16, 1920.

I have the honor to remain,

Very sincerely, yours,

Charles E. Hughes.

I make no comment upon what this record shows. It speaks for itself with convincing force. I may perhaps be pardoned

for making the statement in conclusion, with reference to the last telegram sent to me from President Wilson, in which he expressed his entire contentment to leave the matter in issue between us to the voters of Missouri, that out of 114 counties in Missouri I carried 83 of them at the election of November 3, 1920, and that my majority over my distinguished opponent, who was the warm personal supporter of President Wilson's side of the controversy, and who was himself the Third Assistant Secretary of State when the facts in the dispute were happening, was 121,663.

APPENDIX.

FULL TEXT OF PRESIDENT WILSON'S ADDRESS ON MAY 31, 1919, TO THE PLENARY SESSION OF THE PEACE CONFERENCE,

"The President of the United States, speaking in English,

makes the following speech:
"'Mr. President, I should be very sorry to see this meeting adjourn with permanent impressions such as it is possible may have been created by some of the remarks that our friends have made. I should be very sorry to have the impression lodged in your minds that the great powers desire to assume or play any arbitrary rôle in these great matters, or presume, because of any pride of authority, to exercise an undue influence in these matters, and therefore I want to call your attention to one aspect of these questions which has not been dwelt upon.

"'We are trying to make a peaceful settlement; that is to say, to eliminate those elements of disturbance, so far as possible, which may interfere with the peace of the world, and we are trying to make an equitable distribution of territories according to the race, the ethnographical character of the people in-

habiting them.

"'And back of that lies this fundamentally important fact that, when the decisions are made, the Allied and Associated Powers guarantee to maintain them. It is perfectly evident, upon a moment's reflection, that the chief burden of their maintenance will fall upon the great powers. The chief burden of the war fell upon the greater powers, and if it had not been for their action, their military action, we would not be here to settle these questions. Therefore, we must not close our eyes to the fact that in the last analysis the military and naval strength of the great powers will be the final guaranty of the peace of the

"'In those circumstances, is it unreasonable and unjust that, not as dictators but as friends, the great powers should say to their associates, "We can not afford to guarantee territorial settlements which we do not believe to be right, and we can not agree to leave elements of disturbance unremoved, which we believe will disturb the peace of the world?"

"'Take the rights of minorities. Nothing, I venture to say, is

more likely to disturb the peace of the world than the treatment which might in certain circumstances be meted out to minorities. And therefore if the great powers are to guarantee the peace of the world in any sense, is it unjust that they should be satisfied that the proper and necessary guaranties have been given?

"'I beg our friends from Rumania and from Serbia to re-member that while Rumania and Serbia are ancient sovereignties the settlements of this conference are greatly adding to their territories. You can not in one part of our transactions treat Serbia alone and in all of the other parts treat the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes as a different entity, for they are seeking the recognition of this conference as a single entity, and if this conference is going to recognize these various powers as new sovereignties within definite territories, the chief guarantors are entitled to be satisfied that the territorial settlements are of a character to be permanent, and that the guaranties given are of a character to ensure the peace of the world.

"'It is not, therefore, the intervention of those who would interfere, but the action of those who would help. I beg that our friends will take that view of it, because I see no escape from

that view of it.

"'How can a power like the United States, for examplefor I can speak for no other-after signing this treaty, if it contains elements which they do not believe will be permanent, go 3,000 miles away across the sea and report to its people that it has made a settlement of the peace of the world? It can not do so. And yet there underlies all of these transactions the expectation on the part, for example, of Rumania and of Czechoslovakia and of Serbia that if any covenants of this settlement are not observed the United States will send her

armies and her navies to see that they are observed.
"'In those circumstances is it unreasonable that the United States should insist upon being satisfied that the settlements are correct? Mr. Bratiano-and I speak of his suggestions with the utmost respect-suggested that we could not, so to say, invade the sovereignty of Rumania, an ancient sovereignty, and make certain prescriptions with regard to the rights of minorities. But I beg him to observe that he is overlooking the fact that he is asking the sanction of the allied and associated powers for great additions of territory which come to Rumania by the common victory of arms, and that, therefore, we are entitled to say: "If we agree to these additions of territory, we have the right to insist upon certain guaranties of peace."

"'I beg mry friend Mr. Kramar and my friend Mr. Trumbitch and my friend Mr. Bratiano to believe that if we should feel that it is best to leave the words which they have wished to omit in the treaty it is not because we want to insist upon unreasonable conditions, but that we want the treaty to accord to us the right of judgment as to whether these are things which we

can afford to guarantee.

Therefore the impressions with which we should disperse ought to be these, that we are all friends-of course, that goes without saying-but that we must all be associates in a common effort, and there can be no frank and earnest association in the common effort unless there is a common agreement as to

what the rights and settlements are.

"'Now, if the agreement is a separate agreement among groups of us, that does not meet the object. If you should adopt the language suggested by the Czechoslovakian delegation and the Serbian delegation—the Jugo-Slav delegation—that it should be left to negotiation between the principal allied and associated powers and their several delegates, that would mean that after this whole conference is adjourned groups of them would determine what is to be the basis of the peace of the world. It seems to me that that would be a most dangerous idea to entertain, and therefore I beg that we may part with a sense, not of interference with each other but of hearty and friendly cooperation upon the only possible basis of guaranty. Where the great force lies there must be the sanction of peace. sometimes wish in hearing an argument like this that I were the representative of a small power, so that what might be robbed of any mistaken significance, but I think you will agree with me that the United States has never shown any temper of aggression anywhere, and it lies in the heart of the people of the United States, as I am sure it lies in the hearts of the peoples of the other great powers, to form a common partnership of right and to do service to our associates and no kind of disservice."

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES-OPEN EXECUTIVE SESSIONS.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President-

Mr. WATSON of Indiana. As the Senator from Arizona is about to address the Senate on his amendment increasing the duty on cotton, I ask that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Arizona yield

merely for a brief announcement?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield. Mr. HARRISON. This morning before the regular order was demanded I had moved the consideration of a resolution, under a notice that had been filed some days before, to change the rules of the Senate. It is now only 40 minutes until the hour arrives to take up the unfinished business. I imagine that the resolution to which I refer will precipitate some debate, so I shall not press it during the morning hour this morning, but hope, with the acquiescence of Senators in charge of the pending legislation, to get it up to-morrow immediately following the speech of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2435) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, and to provide revenue; to regulate commerce with foreign countries; to prevent the dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States; to regulate the value of foreign money; and for other purposes.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, some misapprehension exists as to the meaning of lines 14 and 15 on page 3 of the emergency tariff bill, and I shall ask the Senate to indulge me while I try to make an explanation as to what those words and figures

mean:

It will be remembered that when the emergency tariff bill was pending before the Senate in the third session of the Sixty-sixth Congress I offered an amendment practically the same as the amendment I am now going to discuss. The amendment was to strike out the numeral "7" and to insert the numeral "20" The lines to which I now address myself are found on page 3 of the bill, lines 14 and 15 thereof, reading as follows:

16. Cotton having a staple of 1% inches or more in length, 7 cents per

My amendment proposes to strike out the numeral "7" and to insert in lieu thereof the numeral "20," so that the rate of duty would be 20 cents on cotton having a staple or fiber 1s inches or more. The remarks I am about to make may be tedious to Senators, as they are statistical in character, but I believe it is my duty to make some explanation in detail as to the expansion of this industry. I now read from a pamphlet entitled "Cotton Production in the Irrigated Southwest in 1920," by Mr. C. S. Scofield, of the United States Department of Agriculture:

"COTTON PRODUCTION IN THE IRRIGATED SOUTHWEST IN 1920. "THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDUSTRY.

"[By C. S. Scofield, United States Department of Agriculture.]

"Prior to 1905 cotton was practically an unknown crop on the irrigated lands of the southwestern United States. attempt was made to produce the crop in the San Joaquin Valley in California in 1873 and 1874, but high labor costs and the low prices for the product caused the experiment to be abandoned.

From 1905 to 1912 numerous experiments with cotton were made in the irrigated valleys of Arizona and southern California, and by 1912 the crop was fairly well established in several places. In that year the first commercial quantity of cotton of the Egyptian type was grown. Varieties of the American upland type were produced in commercial quantities

as early as 1909. "From 1912 to 1920 the acreage devoted to cotton has increased rapidly, particularly in the last three years, when the stimulus of war demands and consequent high prices have been felt. It is probable that, including some 30,000 acres of upland cotton in he Pecos and Rio Grande Valleys in Texas and New Mexico, there have been not far from 500,000 acres devoted to cotton in the Southwest in 1920. This acreage includes also about 125,000 acres in Lower California, adjacent to the Imperial Valley, operated largely under American supervision, the product of which is marketed through American channels.

Of this half million acres of cotton about one-half, or 250,000 acres, was devoted to the production of the Pima variety, which is of the type known commercially as Egyptian. This variety produces a fiber 12 to 15 inches in length. For the acreage devoted to upland cotton there has been no standardization of seed supply, and there has been much varietal mixture and consequent deterioration. At first there were some fairly pure stocks of Triumph or Mebane (1-inch staple) and of Durango (11-inch staple), but these have been intermixed and contaminated with still other varieties until there is practically no pure seed of upland cotton available for general planting in the With the Pima variety there is an ample supply of pure planting seed available each year since 1917.

"During the last 10 years, within which the irrigated area devoted to cotton has extended from practically nothing to approximately 500,000 acres, there has been a very large extension of the area of irrigated land. In the aggregate and within the sections where cotton has been grown the increase of irrigated area has probably been nearly equal to the increase in cotton acreage. But the relatively high value of the cotton crop, and the requirements of capital, labor, and machinery for its production and marketing, and for the manufacture of its seed products, combine to make it a factor of the first importance in the agricultural complex of the irrigated Southwest.

Because of its rapid growth and because of the profitable returns it has given in the past three years, this industry has attracted wide attention. In the matter of returns the industry has had two bad years-one in 1914, when the outbreak of the World War caused a temporary market stagnation, and the other in 1920, when a general decline in the prices of agricultural products set in late in the season, which had been conspicuous for the high costs of labor and materials required in production.

It is still too early to determine the final effect of the present price recession on the cotton industry of this region, but it seems clear that it has temporarily at least reached the end of its first period of rapid expansion, and that it must from now on settle into a more stable equilibrium with its associated indus-

"THE TWO KINDS OF COTTON.

"The two kinds of cotton now being grown in the irrigated Southwest differ from each other in so many important respectsbotanical, agronomic, and commercial—that they must be considered separately in order to avoid continual confusion in the discussion of the subject. It has been noted above that the upland type of cotton includes several varieties which have been hopelessly intermixed with consequent deterioration of quality and yield. The Pima cotton, on the other hand, is all of the one variety; the seed for the entire 250,000 acres grown in 1920 having come from a single plant selected in 1911. Continuing care has been exercised to prevent varietal mixture either in the field or at the gin, and thus the most important, if not the only, cause

of varietal deterioration has been eliminated.

"Upland cotton can be matured in a shorter growing season than Pima. The latter requires a growing season of 275 to 300 days between frosts, while the former may be grown safely with 225 days. Upland cotton is ginned on saw gins, while the Pima variety is ginned on roller gins. The lint of both types is marketed in the same kind of bales, and the seed of both types is manufactured in the same way. It has been the general experience in the Southwest that upland cotton yields somewhat more lint per acre than Pima, possibly 30 per cent more, but the yields of seed cotton are approximately the same for both kinds. On the other hand, the lint of the Pima variety has the higher market value, possibly double that of upland. The production costs are about the same for both, while the harvesting costs are nearly twice as much for Pima as for upland. It is not the purpose here, however, to discuss the relative merits of the two types of cotton for the region under consideration, but rather to point out the differences, and then to discuss certain features of each branch of the industry separately.

" THE UPLAND COTTON AREAS. " Pecos Valley.

"Proceeding from East to West, cotton is found under irrigation first in the Pecos Valley in New Mexico and Texas. In this region of high altitude and short growing season only upland cotton can be grown. The 1920 crop is estimated at 7,000 bales, which probably represents about 10,000 acres, of which a small portion is presumed to be Durango and the re-mainder is made up of varieties of the Texas big boll type. In 1918 the pink bollworm was reported from one section of the valley, but prompt measures have apparently been successful in checking its spread. The Mexican boll weevil has not been reported as causing damage in this section.

" Rio Grande Valley.

"In the Rio Grande Valley, both north and south of El Paso, where water from the Elephant Butte Reservoir is available, upland cotton has been grown in 1919 and 1920. In the latter season it is reported that there were about 22,000 acres devoted to the crop. Earlier experiments with Pima cotton had shown that the season was too short for this variety because of the high altitude. Late in November, 1920, two areas of pink bollworm infestation were found. One just southeast of the city of El Paso and the other up the valley close to the line of New Mexico. The quarantine measures that may be necessitated by the presence of this insect, together with the present low prices for cotton, may cause a reduction of the cotton acreage in this section for the near future. The agronomic conditions have been very favorable, and if protection from insect injury can be had, the cotton crop should find an important place in this valley.

"Yuma Valley.

"On the Yuma reclamation project conditions are favorable to the production of both upland and Pima cotton. Upland cotton was first grown there on a substantial scale in 1914, but adverse market conditions that year caused a reduction in the acreage in 1915, while from 1916 on there has been a rapid increase. In 1917 some Egyptian cotton of the Yuma variety was planted, but the returns from the upland varieties were so high that this type continued to be the more commonly grown. In 1920 special inducements were offered by several tire companies for the production of Pima cotton, so that about 10,000 acres were planted to that variety, while possibly 15,000

to 18,000 acres were planted to upland varieties.

"As early as 1912 the Department of Agriculture recommended to the farmers of the Yuma Valley that they try cotton of the Egyptian type, but without result. In 1913 some Durango seed was distributed, and in 1914 Durango was planted extensively, as was Triumph and some other Texas varieties. At the present time the seed of these upland varieties has been so badly mixed that the 1920 crop is highly unsatisfactory. The quarantine regulations, both State and National, make it difficult, if not impossible, to import new supplies of planting seed, and there are indications that the farmers may be forced to establish for themselves locally supplies of pure seed for planting. It is not yet clear which of the varieties will be adopted, nor is it clear that in the present period of low prices there will be effective action taken to provide pure planting seed.

"It has been demonstrated that very large yields of cotton can be secured in the Yuma Valley, particularly in the lower valley near Somerton and Gadsden. On some of this land cotton-root rot is serious. Some insect pests and plant diseases have been troublesome—for example, the cotton aphis, the cot-

ton stainer, and anthracnose. There have been some cultural difficulties, such as getting good stands and irrigating properly, but, on the whole, upland cotton has done well, and in years of good prices the crop returns have been satisfactory. Up to the present time neither the pink bollworm nor the Mexican boll weevil has been in this valley nor in the adjacent irrigated valleys of California.

"Imperial Valley.

"For purposes of discussing the cotton industry the Imperial Valley may be held to include the area irrigated by the diversion from the Colorado River at Pilot Knob, just above-the international boundary. This area includes something over 130,000 acres of land in the territory of Baja California, Mexico, and something less than 400,000 in Imperial County, Calif. Cotton has been produced in substantial quantities in this region since 1910. In 1920 almost the whole of the irrigated area in Baja California was planted to cotton, while about 90,000 acres of the irrigated land in Imperial County was planted to cotton. of which about 28,000 acres was planted to the Pima variety. Prior to 1920 the Pima acreage in the Imperial Valley was so small as to be negligible, but this year the tire companies secured the planting of this variety in Imperial County by a system of contracts similar to those used in the Yuma Valley. very little Pima cotton planted on the Mexican side of the line.

Except for two or three properties, all of the irrigated land in Baja California is operated under lease from the Colorado River Land Co. (successor of the California-Mexican Land & Cattle Co.). This cotton land is rented, generally for cash, first year \$2.50, second year \$5, third year \$7.50, and fourth and fifth years \$10 per acre. In addition, the renter pays the taxes, about \$1.60 per acre, and the water charge, about \$8 to \$9 per acre. This acreage has been operated in large properties with rather shiftless cultural methods. It is estimated by a man familiar with local conditions that not over 10 per cent of this cotton land has ever been plowed, almost no attempt has been made to grow other crops than cotton, possibly for the reason that the Mexican Government has maintained very high duties, either export or import, that have tended to discourage general farming. Most of the money used for growing the cotton crop on the Mexican side of the line is provided by American concerns, among which the Globe Milling Co. has been latterly one of the most important. This concern now owns most of the ginning plants in the Imperial Valley, as well as one or more oil mills. It bought out recently the properties built up by Messrs. Dale and Speer, of Fort Worth and El Paso.

"The seed cotton, cotton seed, and cotton lint produced in Baja California is all marketed in the United States. On moving across the line through the port of Mexicali it is assessed the following export duties: For baled lint or seed cotton the export tax is equivalent to \$12.54, American money, for each 1,000 kilos. For cotton seed the export tax is equivalent to \$5.825, American money, for each 1,000 kilos. The Federal Horticultural Board of the United States Department of Agriculture is represented at Calexico by Mr. O. A. Pratt, who inspects the cotton fields in Baja California, supervises all imports from Mexico or the eastern United States with a view to preventing the introduction of dangerous insect pests, and issues permits for the importation of the Mexican-grown cotton into

the United States.

"In Imperial County cotton was grown in 1920 on rather less than 25 per cent of the cropped land. This proportion of the acreage in cotton would not be in excess of the limits of good farming if the crop were incorporated into a systematic rotation. Too often this is not the case. Much of the cotton is grown year after year on the same land or put on new land by Prior to 1919 the whole Imperial Valley suffered a renters. water shortage some time each summer, often at a time when the need of water was most acute for the cotton crop. As a result of these conditions, there have been many poor yields, and the crop as a whole has been scarcely profitable to the growers even during the recent years of high prices.

"Partly because of these recurring water shortages and partly because of shifting and speculative propensities of the cotton growers of the valley, the cost of credit has been relatively high. There has been a conspicuous lack of community cooperation in dealing with such problems as seed supply, labor, and markets. Cotton production has not been handled efficiently, other industries have been periodically more profitable, and, taken as a whole, the cotton situation in the Imperial Valley falls short of being satisfactory. It seems probable that if the present marketing conditions continue the acreage next season will be

reduced.

" Coachella Valley.

"The Coachella Valley, which is the name applied to a north-westward extension of the same depression in which the Im-

perial Valley lies, has not been an important cotton-producing section. Early truck crops and dates have attracted more attention than cotton, though there are many good-sized fields of that crop in the valley this year. Previous experiments had shown that the climatic conditions were rather too severe for Pima cotton, chiefly because of strong winds in the spring and high summer temperatures. Some upland cotton has been grown with rather indifferent success for several years. In 1920 the high prices prevailing for Pima cotton in the Salt River Valley attracted the attention of farmers in the Coachella Valley and an aggregate of a few hundred acres of Pima cotton was planted. A somewhat larger acreage, probably not over 1,000 or 1,500 acres, was also planted to upland varieties, including some thought to be Durango.

"The water supply of the Coachella Valley comes from moderately deep wells which tap an underflow, fed from the mountains which surround it on the west. In the lower end of the valley, the southeastern end, these wells flow freely; at the upper end, the westward end, it is necessary to lift the water 15 to 25 feet, for which cheap hydroelectric power, supplied by

the Southern Sierras Co., is used. "At the Indio Date Garden, of which Mr. Bruce Drummond is superintendent, two small plats of upland cotton of the Acala variety were planted in the spring of 1920. One of these plats was located on desert soil and the other on land that had been Both plats were well cared for though rather a in alfalfa. poor stand was obtained on the plat on alfalfa land. Despite the severe summer temperatures, the plants on both plats grew well and fruited abundantly. Prior to November 30 the desert-soil plat of a little over one-half acre had been picked twice and had yielded at the rate of 3,300 pounds of seed cotton per acre. The other plat had not all been picked over at the date mentioned, but so far as then picked was yielding at the rate of 3,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre. These plats were planted with fairly pure seed of the variety, and because of this fact and the high yield and attractive appearance of the crop they were attracting wide attention both in the Coachella and Imperial Valleys. It seems probable that some attempt will be made to give this variety further trial in this region and possibly also to provide for the continued production of a pure seed supply.

"It is hardly to be expected that a large acreage of cotton will be produced in the Coachella Valley, nor that the Pima variety will be grown there, but it may be that a small acreage may be devoted to the production of the Acala or some other upland variety on a pure-seed basis, with a view to selling planting seed in the Imperial Valley, or even in Texas and Oklahoma, where there is a continuing demand for pure seed of good vitality.

" San Joaquin Valley.

"In the San Joaquin Valley the first serious experiments with cotton production were begun in 1917 near Bakersfield and Fresno. In 1920 there is assumed to be something like 20,000 acres of cotton in the valley, of which about half is upland and half is Pima. Bakersfield and Fresno continue to be the chief centers, but there are several fields around different points between these towns and the Boston Land Co. west of Fresno has planted some 2,500 acres of cotton, chiefly Durango.

"Most of the planting seed for the San Joaquin upland cotton was brought from the Imperial Valley and is badly mixed. There is one lot of Acala cotton from seed sent from Oklahoma by the Department of Agriculture in the spring of 1919 that was grown on about 100 acres of land in 1920, which is still fairly pure and has made a good showing.

"Most of the cotton in the San Joaquin Valley is grown with pumped water, which is relatively expensive. On some of the higher lands the lift required is 100 feet or more. Unless the price of cotton should continue relatively high it is doubtful if upland cotton can be grown profitably on the higher lands. On the lower lands where the water lift is less and where alfalfa, barley, and rice are now the chief crops, it may be practicable to continue the production of upland cotton, particularly if pure seed of the long staple varieties is used.

"The outstanding feature of the San Joaquin Valley is the fruitfulness of cotton. This is true both with the upland and the Pima. There is must less boll shedding than in the valleys south and east and the potential yield is correspondingly high. There is danger, however, that ripening of the late crop may be

hindered by foggy weather.

"In addition to the areas enumerated above, upland cotton has been grown in a number of other localities in the irrigated Southwest, for example, in the Blythe district, the Parker Indian Reservation, and in several of the mountain valleys in southern California. In none of these has the acreage been very

large. In some of them cotton may become relatively important with the development of additional water supplies.

"The preceding paragraphs may be summarized in a tabular statement as to the irrigated acreagé of upland cotton in the Southwest in 1920, with the reservation that these figures are merely provisional estimates.

"Upland cotton in the irrigated Southwest in 1920.

	Acres.	
Pecos Valley	10,000	
Upper Rio Grande Valley	22, 000	
Yuma Valley	18, 000	
Imperial Valley, Mexico	125, 000	
Imperial Valley, Calif	60, 000	
Coachella Valley	1,000	
San Joaquin Valley	10,000	
Other valleys	9,000	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5,000	
Total	255 000	

"THE PRODUCTION OF PIMA COTTON.

"Prior to 1920 Pima cotton was extensively produced only in the Salt River Valley in Arizona. Experimental plantings had been made in other localities and the variety was well known throughout the region in which its production is possible. The Egyptian type of cotton to which the Pima belongs was first produced in the Salt River Valley in 1912. From that year until 1916 the original American selection, known as the Yuma variety, was used. The Pima variety, which came from a single plant of the Yuma variety, was selected in 1911 and was carefully tested during the next four years. Its superiority had been so clearly established by 1915 that arrangements were made to substitute it for the older variety in the Salt River Valley. Accordingly, a supply of seed sufficient to plant 275 acres was furnished a group of farmers near Tempe, Ariz., in the spring of 1916 and from this acreage a supply of pure seed was produced with which to plant the entire cotton acreage of the valley in 1917. This one variety has been grown exclusively in that valley since that time. The purity of the variety has been maintained by separate ginning and careful field inspection.

"The progress of cotton production in the Salt River Valley is shown in the following table, which gives the acreage and the yield of cotton for each year since 1912. The figures for acreage are only approximate; those for yields are as given in the ginning report published by the Bureau of the Census.

Cotton acreage and yields in the Salt River Valley.

	Acres.	Bales.
1912 1913 1914 1915 1916 1917 1918 1919	480 3,800 12,000 2,000 6,800 29,000 78,000 85,000 180,000	375 2, 135 6, 187 1, 095 3, 331 115, 966 236, 187 242, 374

In addition to the acreage in the Salt River Valley there were 4,000 acres in the Yuma Valley and 200 acres in the Imperial Valley which contributed to this yield.

In 1918 it is estimated that Pima cotton was grown on 3,000 acres in the Yuma Valley, 3,000 acres in the Imperial Valley, 2,000 acres in the San Joaquin Valley, and 500 acres in the Palo Verde Valley, the yield of which is included above. In 1919 there was probably as much of an acreage grown outside of the Salt River Valley.

The complete ginning return for the 1920 crop is not available at the time of writing.

"The price at which this cotton has sold each year is obviously a difficult matter to determine. In the earlier years, when the crop was small, fairly accurate information was available, but in the later years, when the crop was larger and the marketing season extended over many months during which price changes were sometimes very great, it was no longer possible to learn the price at which the crop left the producers' hands. The following figures are set down as the best estimate that can be made of the average price obtained by the grower each year:

"It will be observed from a comparison of the two tables above that a marked increase in cotton acreage has followed promptly on a sharp advance in price. The acreage increase in 1920 was still further stimulated not only in the Salt River Valley but elsewhere in the Southwest by two factors: The price of cotton advanced rapidly throughout the marketing season from

an opening around 60 cents to a final price of \$1.25, and several of the large tire manufacturing companies offered to contract with growers for the crop, with a guaranteed basis of 60 cents per pound and as much as 75 cents in some cases.

per pound and as much as 75 cents in some cases.

"The entire Pima acreage in the Southwest in 1920 may be

provisionally estimated as follows:

	Acre	es.
Salt River Valley	185,	000
Yuma Valley	10,	000
Imperial Valley	30,	000
San Joaquin Valley		000
Other valleys	5,	000
motel.	240	000

"From this acreage it would appear to be safe at the present time to estimate a crop of 120,000 bales.

"The entire acreage of irrigated cotton in the Southwest for

"The entire acreage of irrigated cotton in the Southwest for 1920 may be estimated as follows:

	Upland.	Pima.
Pecos Valley Upper Rio Grande Salt River Valley Yuma Valley Imperial Valley, Mexico. Imperial Valley, California Coachella Valley San Joaquin Valley. Other valleys.	Acres. 10,000 22,000 18,000 125,000 60,000 1,000 10,000 9,000	185,000 10,000 30,000 10,000 5,000
Total	255, 000	240,000

"GINS AND GINNING.

"The production of cotton involves the installation of gins and oil mills, and the character of the control of the former at least has a very important relation to the welfare of production. The following is a list of the roller gins operating in the Southwest in November, 1920, as furnished by Mr. S. H. Hastings and checked by Messrs, McLachlan and Camp:

"Roller gins in the Southwest in 1920.

SALT RIVER VALLEY.

Southwest Cotton Co	180
McCall (Firestone)	80
Atha (American Thread Co.)	18 10
Tempe ExchangePhoenix Ginning Co. (Fisk)	20
Farmers' Gin	20
Scottsdale (Cooperative)	10
Buckeye (Dunlap)	20
Mesa (Attaway-Phelps)	
Total	390
YUMA VALLEY.	
Southwest Cotton Co	20
McCall (Firestone)	12
	200
Total	32
IMPERIAL VALLEY,	
Southwest Cotton Co	
Fowler (Fisk)	
El Centro gin	
Deciey	- 2
Total	70
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY.	
Arvin and Shafter (Cooperative)	20
Wasco	10
Bakersfield	
Total	56
Grand total	548
"Those relies give are capable of turning out 11 to 9 h	olog

"These roller gins are capable of turning out $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 bales of cotton per day if run continuously with two shifts of men. When equipped with self-feeders a 10-stand plant requires a

crew of eight or nine men for its operation.

"Notwithstanding the large number of gins in the Salt River Valley in 1920, this number was not adequate to keep up with the volume of cotton being picked at the height of the season. In the latter part of November there were estimated to be 30,000 cotton pickers at work in that valley, gathering daily at least 1,000 tons of seed cotton, or the equivalent of 1,000 bales of lint. The daily ginning capacity was hardly above 700 bales per day.

"The charge made for ginning Pima cotton in 1920 is \$1.20 per hundred pounds of seed cotton, which includes the bagging and ties and an assessment of \$4 per bale for the support of the organization that imports the labor for picking. It is said, on good authority, that the actual cost of ginning is somewhat higher than this. In 1912 and 1913 the regular charge for gin-

ning was about 50 cents per hundred pounds of seed cotton, or \$10 per bale, and the gins as then operated required the serv-

ices of one man at each gin as a feeder.

"The mechanical feeders now in general use seem to be giving good satisfaction. Some new departures are being made in the covering of the rolls on the gins. Formerly the gin rolls were covered with strips of heavy leather, wound spirally on a wooden core and glued and pegged in position. Latterly a type of heavy hydraulic packing, made of rubber and cotton, has been used. At first this packing was put on in a series of disks pressed close together; later it was used in spiral strips alternating with strips of leather. Finally some rolls are being tried with the packing used alone in the spiral form just as the leather was formerly used.

"The ginning of the upland cotton crop, which is done with saw gins, is in general adequately provided for. In fact, in the Imperial Valley there were more saw gins than were needed for the volume of the crop coming off the plants at the end of November. The charge for saw ginning is this year 35 cents per hundred pounds of seed cotton, with an additional charge of

\$2.25 per bale for bagging and ties.

"There are a number of oil mills in the Southwest for the manufacture of cotton seed. Prior to the war these mills paid about \$15 per ton for seed. This price was advanced during the war until in 1919 seed sold up to \$85, and possibly even as high as \$100, per ton. In 1920 the price of seed dropped back to the general level of \$15 to \$20 per ton. These prices were so disappointing that many farmers who had live stock were hauling their seed home from the gin with the intention of feeding it unless a better price could be secured.

"Up to the present time it has not been customary to compress the Pima cotton at primary shipping points. Some of the crop, moving eastward by way of Galveston, has probably been compressed for ocean shipment, but much of the crop has gone through to the mills in the low-density bales turned out at the gin. The upland crop, on the other hand, has largely been compressed at primary points. There are two compresses in the Imperial Valley, one at Imperial and the other at Calexico.

"The Pima crop is sampled at the gin before the bale is packed. The upland crop is sampled in the gin yard or at the compress, each bale being slashed on both sides for the sample.

"THE LABOR SITUATION.

"Ohe of the earliest problems in connection with the establishment of cotton production in the Southwest was that of securing the labor for picking the crop. Labor has always been relatively scarce and high priced in these new regions, and it was feared that the labor requirements of the cotton crop might be difficult to meet. At first it was thought that it might be possible to draw upon the Indians of the various Arizona reservations for the cotton-picking season, and during the first years that cotton was grown numbers of Pimas and Papagos were brought into the Salt River Valley for the picking season. As the cotton acreage was extended, however, it became clear that the supply of Indian labor available would not be sufficient to meet the needs of the cotton growers and it was decided to seek additional labor in Mexico.

"The effective importation of Mexican labor required money and united action. To meet these needs the farmers of the Salt River Valley formed a labor organization and selected Mr. W. H. Knox to take charge of the work. The necessary money was raised by an ingenious expedient. All of the gin owners of the valley were persuaded to sign an agreement that they would increase the ginning charge by \$2 per bale above the regular charge and pay over to the labor organization the money so collected to be used as a fund for securing pickers.

"With these signed agreements as collateral the management of the labor organization was able to borrow from the local banks the money needed for its operations early in the season. This enterprise was launched in the summer of 1916. For the first two years labor was sought not only in Mexico but from Texas and Oklahoma and other points in the older cotton belt. Later it was found easier to get results from Mexico, so that recently that country has been the chief source of supply.

"If has been necessary for the labor organization to get a special dispensation from the Federal immigration authorities to bring this labor in. The immigrants not eligible for permanent entry must be returned to Mexico. It has been found advisable to bring in families, and this has necessitated the provision of medical care, shelter for living, and schooling for children. So far as can now be judged, this plan of importing labor has worked out well in the Salt River Valley. It has been possible to bring in sufficient labor to fill the need, and thus to prevent undue increases in the cost of cotton picking. At first the current rate of pay for cotton picking (Pima cotton) was

\$2 per hundred pounds of seed cotton. This rate has been increased from time to time until in 1920 the pickers are paid \$4

per hundred pounds.

picker for each 12 acres.

"It is estimated by Mr. Knox that there were in the Salt River Valley in 1920 about 30,000 cotton pickers. Of these, about 15,000 were brought in from Mexico during the season, about 5,000 were Mexicans who had remained in the valley from previous seasons, and the remaining 10,000 included those diverted from other work in the valley and those who came in on their own account from other sections.

"Attempts have been made to extend the operations of the Salt River Valley labor organization to the Yuma and Imperial Valleys, but so far without conspicuous success. In the Imperial Valley south of the line it is possible to use Chinese, Japanese, and Mexicans almost without restriction, and that district has not suffered any serious labor shortage. North of the line it has been different, labor shortages have been perennial. This past season a serious attempt was made to form a central labor organization patterned after the one in the Salt River Valley. This failed because the ginners would not all agree to assess their patrons and thereby raise the funds. As a result of this lack of organization picking costs have been higher both in the Yuma and Imperial Valleys than in the Salt River Valley and the picking has not been so well done. Apparently no organized effort was made to get cotton pickers for the crop in the San Joaquin Valley this past season. There was, in consequence, a shortage of pickers even at the price of \$5 per hundred, which is equivalent to 19 cents or 20 cents per pound of lint.

"It is estimated that on the average cotton pickers will gather from 60 pounds to 100 pounds of seed cotton per day when working in Pima fields and from 125 to 175 pounds per day in picking upland cotton. Thus on the basis of an average yield of 1,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre from Pima cotton provision must be made for 1 picker for each 6 acres of the crop. For upland cotton, on the other hand, the labor situation might be regarded as satisfactory if there were available 1

"THE COST OF PRODUCTION.

"It is not proposed here to undertake to state how much it costs to produce a pound of cotton in the Southwest. To do so would be like attempting to say how much it costs to build a house. But just as one might in the latter case set down some fairly precise information as to the local prices of brick, cement, lumber, and skilled labor so it is possible to make some estimates at least of the costs involved in the production of cotton. However, these can be no more than estimates. The actual costs will differ from farm to farm and from section to section.

"The production of cotton in the Southwest involves the use of land, of irrigation water, of certain agricultural implements, of labor both of men and horses, of skilled supervision, and finally seed for planting. Items of cost or value such as these may be assessed against each acre of land involved, regardless of the yield obtained. When the crop is ready to harvest the cost items are more conveniently charged against some unit of the crop as the 100 pounds of seed cotton or the bale of lint.

"This matter of production costs is always one of acute interest to cotton growers, but in 1920 the interest became abnormally keen as the season advanced and market prices for cotton declined. Growers and bankers alike felt the need of taking stock of the situation, not only to deal with the immediate problem of operating credits but also to determine a future course of action.

"It may be worth while before taking up current production costs to recall estimates made in 1913 and 1914, when cotton was a new crop in the Salt River Valley. Such estimates were published in Bulletin 332 of the United States Department of Agriculture. They may be listed as follows:

	Table IV.	Table V.
Fixed charges: Land rental or interest and taxes Irrigation water	\$12.00 1,50	\$17. 25 2. 90
	13.50	19. 25
2. Growing cost: Cultural operations and seed	15.00	15.10
Total per acre cost	28.50	34. 35
3. Harvesting cost (per 100 pounds seed cotton): Picking. Hauling to gin. Gimning.	2.00 .21 .56	2,00 .07 .56
Cost per 100 pounds seed cotton	2.77	2.63

"There were three different yields involved in the two tables cited above, (1) 1,200 pounds, (2) 1,800 pounds, and (3) 2,552 pounds, all in terms of seed cotton per acre. The first two were included in the estimate of Table IV and the third in Table V. If we divide the total cost per acre of Table IV by 1,200 we have \$2.37, which, with the harvesting cost of \$2.77, makes a total of \$5.14 per hundred pounds of seed cotton. Similarly we find for the 1,800-pound yield a total cost of \$1.58 plus \$2.77, or \$4.35. Finally, for the third case, with a yield of 2,552 pounds of seed cotton per acre, the cost is \$1.35 plus \$2.63, or \$3.98.

"The ginning experience in 1913 and 1914 was that 100 pounds of seed cotton would yield about 28 pounds of lint and 72 pounds of seed. The seed could then be sold at the gin for \$15 per ton, or 75 cents per hundred pounds. Thus, if we deduct from the cost of the 100 pounds of seed cotton the gin value of the 72 pounds of seed, we have, by dividing the 28 pounds of lint into the remainder, a figure for the net cost of the lint:

"Case 1. Yield, 1,200 pounds: $\$5.14 - \$0.54 = \frac{\$4.60}{28} = 16.4$ cents per pound lint. "Case 2. Yield, 1,800 pounds: $\$4.35 - \$0.54 = \frac{\$3.81}{28} = 13.6$ cents per pound lint. "Case 3. Yield, 2,552 pounds: $\$3.98 - \$0.54 = \frac{\$3.44}{28} = 12.3$ cents per pound lint.

"These figures are approximately what was thought to be the cost of production of Egyptian cotton in the Southwest in the first years of the industry. At that time it was thought that this type of cotton might bring on the average 20 to 22 cents per pound, at which price a fair profit might be made if good yields were obtained. The importance of high yields, even at some increase in the cost of cultural operations, is very obvious. The proportionate amount of fixed charges is so large that it is only with large yields that the unit cost of the product can be reduced.

With this background of prewar costs in mind, we can make a comparable list of the costs prevailing in 1920. It should be kept in mind that in the six years since the time of the earlier estimate land values, as well as the cost of labor and material, have increased very greatly. While the figures given below do not represent any extensive compilation of data, it is believed that they represent fairly well the average of the rather wide range of costs. In the case of land rental or its equivalent, interest on investment, the range for 1920 was Some good land under a long period of rental cost the operator only \$15 per acre. On the other hand, land rented in the spring of 1920 committed the operator in some cases to as much as \$84 per acre for the year. The costs of land preparation and of irrigation water also varied greatly, though probably within narrower limits than the item of land rental. On the other hand, the costs of picking and ginning were nearly if not quite the same in all cases, and the costs of most of the other labor operations were not widely different.

ost of producing Pima cotton in the Salt River Valley in 1929, estimate

cost of producing I ima cotton in the sate hiter valley if	6 1320, C	stimate.
1. Fixed charges: Land rental or interest and taxes Use of machinery and equipment Irrigation water	3, 75	\$43, 75
2. Growing cost: Cultural operations and seed	30. 50 5. 00	35, 50
Total cost per acre		79. 25
3. Harvesting cost (per 100 pounds seed cotton): Picking Hauling to gin Ginning Yardage, insurance, association fees Picking, supervision, tents, etc		4. 00 . 25 1. 20 . 35 . 15
Total		5. 95

"The ginning experience of 1920 showed that 100 pounds of seed cotton would yield about 25 pounds of lint and 75 pounds of seed. The price of seed was somewhat uncertain, but it is hardly safe to estimate it as above \$20 per ton. It is thought that the average yield in 1920 will turn out to be a little above 1,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre (0.5 bale), with many fields giving only 800 pounds and a few giving 1,600 pounds. To cover this range the cost estimates may be given for yields of 800 pounds (0.4 bale), 1,200 pounds (0.6 bale), and 1,600 pounds (0.8 bale). With these data the complete formula for determining the cost of production for any yield may be stated as follows: Divide the acre cost of production by the yield of seed cotton, to the quotient add the harvesting cost, from this sum subtract the value of the seed, and divide the remainder by the

lint percentage to obtain the net cost per pound of lint. For the three yields mentioned we have the following:

1. Yield 800 pounds per sere

$$\left\{\frac{$79.25 + $5.95}{$00}\right\}$$
 - .75 - 60.4 cents.

2. Yield 1,200 pounds per acre:

$$\left\{\frac{\$79.25+\$5.95}{1,200}\right\}$$
 - .75 = 47.2 cents.

3. Yield 1,600 pounds per acre:

$$\left\{\frac{\$79.25+\$5.95}{1,600}\right\}$$
 - .75 = 40.6 cents.

"If we add to these three the formula for the half-bale yield generally estimated for the Salt River Valley we have:

4. Yield 1,000 pounds per acre:

$$\left\{\frac{\$79,25+\$5,95}{1000}\right\}$$
 - .75 - 52,6 cents.

"This figure may be taken as a fair statement of the average

cost of production for the valley in 1920.

"It may be proper at this point to consider the problem of how Pima cotton may be produced at a lower cost in the future. This reduction in cost may be accomplished either by obtaining larger yields or by lowering the land rental and wages, or by a combination of the two. If we are entering upon a period of economic readjustment during which lower prices prevail, it is inevitable that there must be lower returns on capital invested and a lower scale of wages for labor.

"Prior to the war land rentals in the Salt River Valley ranged around \$15 per acre, and the wages of farm labor were little more than half those prevailing in 1920. The prices of agricultural machinery were also much lower five years ago. It is, of course, impossible to forecast the rate or the extent of price readjustment, but it is the part of wisdom to consider seriously

how to reduce production costs.

"In order to simplify this problem as much as possible, at least two basic assumptions may be made, one that Pima seed cotton will turn out 25 per cent at the gin and the other that seed will be worth \$20 a ton. With these two assumptions granted, it is possible to construct a table of cost and yield relationships that will show what yields must be secured with given production costs or what production costs can be allowed with a given yield in order to obtain cotton lint at a certain price. In this table production cost is held to include all charges assignable to an acre of cotton land, such as land rental or interest and taxes; use of machinery and equipment; irrigation water; all costs of growing the crop, such as preparation of the land and planting; planting seed; labor for irrigation, cultivation, thinning and weeding; and supervision of production operations. These items in the 1920 estimate, given above, totaled closed to \$80 per acre. The item in the table designated as net harvesting cost is made to include the cost of picking; hauling to gin; ginning; yardage, insurance, and association fees, picking supervision, tents, etc., less the value of the cotton seed at the gin. Thus, the net harvesting cost given in the 1920 estimate was slightly above \$5 per hundred pounds of seed cotton.

"The following table shows in a striking way how the cost of the lint declines as yields increase. Thus, in the first line of the table, with a production cost of \$80 per acre and a net harvesting cost of \$5 per hundred pounds of seed cotton, the lint cost is 60 cents per pound when the yield is 800 pounds of seed cotton per acre and only 36 cents per pound when the yield is 2,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre. On the other hand, if it is possible to reduce the production cost to \$50 per acre and the net harvesting cost to \$4 per hundred, a yield of only 1,000 pounds per acre can be made at 36 cents.

Table showing the net cost of cotton lint, in cents per pound, with different rates of production cost, harvesting cost, and yield of seed cotton.

$$\frac{P}{Y} + II$$
 $G = C$
 $G = 25$ per cent.

P	II	Y 800	Y 1,000	Y 1,200	Y 1,400	1,600	1,800	Y 2,000
\$90	\$5 4	Cents. 60. 0 56. 0	Cents. 52, 0 48, 0	Cents. 46, 6 42, 6	Cents. 42.8 38.8	Cents. 40, 0 36, 0	Cents. 37. 7 33. 7	Cents. 36. 0 32. 0
\$70	4 3 5 4 3	52, 0 55, 0 51, 0 47, 0	44. 0 48. 0 44. 0 40. 0	38. 6 43. 3 39. 3 35. 3	34. 4 40. 0 36. 0 32. 0	32, 0 37, 5 33, 5 29, 5	29.7 85.5 31.5 27.5	28, 0 34, 0 30, 0 26, 0
\$60	5 4 3	50. 0 46. 0 42. 0	44. 0 40. 0 36. 0	40. 0 36. 0 32. 0	37.1 33.1 29.1	35.0 31.0 27.0	33.3 29.3 25.3	32. 0 28. 0 24. 0

Table showing the net cost of cotton lint, in cents per pound, with different rates of production cost, harvesting cost, and yield of seed cotton—Continued.

P	П	Y 800	Y 1,000	Y 1,200	1,400	Y 1,600	1,800	2,000
\$50	85	Cents. 45.0	Cents. 40, 0 36, 0	Cents. 36. 6 32. 6	Cents. 34. 2 30. 2	Cents. 32.5 28.5	Cents. 31.0 27.0	Cents. 30. 0 28. 0
845	4 3 5 4	41.0 37.0 42.5 38.5	32, 0 38, 0 34, 0	28.6 35.0 31.0	26, 2 32, 8 28, 8	24.5 31.2 27.2	23. 0 30. 0 26. 0	22. 0 29. 0 25. 0
\$10	4 3 5 4	34. 5 40. 0 36. 0	30. 0 36. 0 32. 0	27. 0 33. 3 29. 3	24.8 31.4 27.4	23. 2 30. 0 26. 0	22.0 28,9 24.9	21.0 28.0 24.0
\$35	3 5 4 3	32.0 37.5 33.5 29.5	28. 0 31. 0 30. 0 26. 0	25.3 31.7 27.7 23.7	23. 4 30. 0 26. 0 22. 0	22. 0 28. 8 24. 8 20. 8	20. 9 27, 8 23. 8 19. 8	20.0 27.0 23.0 19.0
\$30	3 5 4 3	35. 0 31. 0 27. 0	32.0 28.0 24.0	30. 0 26. 0 22. 0	28. 5 24. 5 20. 5	27, 5 23, 5 19, 5	26.6 22.6 18.6	26. 0 22. 0 18. 0

Note.—In the column headed ${}^aP^n$ the production cost is given in dollars per acre. In the column headed ${}^aH^n$ the net harvesting cost is given in dollars per hundred pounds of seed cotton. In each yield column is given the corresponding cost of lint in cents per pound. In making these computations it is assumed that the seed cotton yields 25 per cent of lint and that the seed is worth \$20 per ton.

"In considering the cost of producing upland cotton in the Southwest a somewhat different set of figures must be used. In some cases where upland cotton has been produced on less valuable land than Pima cotton the yields, in terms of seed cotton, have been approximately the same, though because of the higher ginning percentage upland has given distinctly higher lint yields. The cost of picking and ginning has been much less.

"On the other hand, the production costs, except for a possibly lower land rental, are approximately the same for the two kinds of cotton. The harvesting costs may be estimated for the

season of 1920 as follows:

Har	vesting cost (per 100 pounds of seed cotton, upland):	
	Picking	\$2,00
	Hauling to gin	. 25
	Ginning, \$0.35, including bag and ties	. 50
	Yardage, insurance, association fees	. 35
	Picking supervision, tents, etc.	. 15
	Mata1	0 0=

"From this total there may be deducted the value of the corton seed at the gin. With a ginning outturn of 33 per cent of lint there should be left 67 pounds of seed, which may be estimated as worth \$20 per ton. This taken from the total harvesting cost leaves \$2.58 as the net harvesting cost.

"If it is assumed that the average yield of upland seed cotton

in the irrigated Southwest in 1920 was 1,000 pounds per acre. or two-thirds of a bale, and that the production cost was as much as \$10 per acre less than for the Pima, because of lower land rental, we find by reference to the following table that the cost of lint would be close to 29 cents per pound.

Table showing the net cost of lint, in cents per pound, with different rates of production cost, harvesting cost, and yield of seed cotton.

$$\frac{P}{Y} + II$$
 $G = 33 \text{ per cent.}$

P	II	Y 800	Y 1,000	Y 1,200	Y 1,400	Y 1,600	Y 1,800	Y 2,000
\$80	\$2.50	Cents.	Cents. 31.8	Cents.	Cents. 24.9	Cents.	Cents. 21.0	Cents.
\$70	2.00	36. 4	30.3	26. 2	23.4	21. 2	19.5	18.2
	1.50	34. 9	28.8	24. 7	21.9	19. 7	18.0	16.7
	2.50	32. 6	28.8	25. 2	22.7	20. 8	19.4	18.2
\$60	2.00	31. 1	27.3	23.7	21. 2	19.3	17. 9	16. 7
	1.50	29. 6	25.8	22.2	19. 7	17.8	16. 4	15. 2
	2.50	30. 3	25.7	22.7	20. 6	18.9	17. 7	16. 7
\$50	2.00	28.8	24. 2	21. 2	19.1	17.4	16. 2	15. 2
	1.50	27.3	22. 7	19. 7	17.6	15.9	14. 7	13. 7
	2.50	26.5	22. 7	20. 2	18.4	17.1	16. 0	15. 2
\$45	2.00 1.50 2.50	25.0 23.5 24.6	21.2 19.7 21.2	18.7 17.2 18.9	16.9 15.4 17.3	15.6 14.1 16.1	14.5 13.0 15.2	13.7 12.2
840	2.00 1.50 2.50	23.1 21.5 22.7	19.7 18.2 19.7	17.4 15.9 17.7	15.8 14.3 16.2	14.6 13.1 15.2	13.7 12.2 14.3	14.4 12.9 11.4 13.6
	2.00	21. 2	18.2	16. 2	14.7	13.7	12.8	12.1
	1.50	19. 7	16.7	14. 7	13.2	12.2	11.3	10.6
\$35	2.50	20.8	18.2	16. 4	15.2	14.2	13.5	12.9
	2.00	19.3	16.7	14. 9	13.7	12.7	12.0	11.4
	1.50	17.8	15.2	13. 4	12.2	11.2	10.5	9.9
\$30	2,50	18.9	16, 7	15. 2	14.1	13.3	12.6	12,1
	2,00	17.4	15, 2	13. 7	12.6	11.8	11.1	10,6
	1,50	15.9	13, 7	12. 2	11.1	10.3	9.6	9,1

Note.—In the column headed "P" the production cost is given in dollars per acre. In the column headed "P" the not harvesting cost is given in dollars per hundred pounds of seed cotton. In each yield column is given the corresponding cost of lint in cents per pound. In making these computations it is assumed that the seed cotton yields 33 per cent of lint and that the seed is worth \$20 per ton.

"It has been the general experience for many years that cotton of 1\(\frac{1}{8}\)-inch staple, such as the Pima, is worth in the market one year with another about twice as much per pound as upland cotton of 1-inch staple. There is no good reason for expecting that this price relationship will be changed materially in the near future.

"Even in the demoralized market at the close of the year 1920, when upland cotton is worth only 12 cents to 13 cents to the grower in the Southwest, Pima cotton could be sold at better than 30 cents. Where the two kinds of cotton have been grown on the same class of land in 1920 each yielding 1,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre, equivalent to one-half of a bale of Pima and two-thirds of a bale of upland, it will be seen by reference to the two preceding cost tables that the net cost of the Pima lint is nowhere twice as much as the net cost of the upland lint. Even with the lowest production cost given in the table, \$30 per acre, and allowing the corresponding net harvesting costs of \$5 for Pima and \$2.50 for upland, the table shows that for the 1,000-pound yield a lint cost of 32 cents for Pima and of 16.7 cents for upland. A comparison of these net costs with current market values gives no ground for changing from Pima production to the production of upland cotton.

"THE IMPORTANCE OF INCREASED YIELDS.

"The most conspicuous feature of the cotton situation in the Southwest in 1920 was the importance of getting larger yields. It was to be expected that with such a large increase in acreage much of the land planted to cotton would be found unsuited to the crop, and many of the farmers with little or no previous experience would make serious mistakes in the cultural operations, particularly in irrigation.

"It is not the purpose here to attempt to point out in detail the mistakes made in land selection or in cultural practice. It is intended rather to point out that large yields are essential to cheap production. To make this point clear one has only to study the tables given in the previous chapter. Take, for instance, the first of these which deals with Pima cotton, the first line of which shows a production cost of \$80 per acre and a net harvesting cost of \$5 per hundred pounds of seed cotton. When the yield is 800 pounds per acre the net cost of lint is shown to be 60 cents per pound, while a yield of 2,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre, not an unusual yield for good land and good care, shows a net cost of only 36 cents per pound of lint.

"This matter can be stated in another way. Supposing there were two farmers growing cotton with a scale of harvesting costs that would net \$5 per hundred pounds of seed cotton and with a market outlet at 35 cents per pound for the lint, so that they would aim to make the crop for at least 33.3 cents per pound. If one of them should so handle his operations as to make a crop of 1,200 pounds of seed cotton while his neighbor with more skill or better land made 1,800 pounds per acre, the first farmer would get only \$40 per acre to cover production costs and land rental, while the other would have \$60 to apply on the same account.

"Some of the land in the Salt River Valley, for instance, is not well suited to cotton because of some inherent quality, such as alkali or liability to root rot. But for the most part, the low yields that have been obtained have been due either to adverse climatic conditions, improper cultural management, or lack of suitable crop rotation. Of these difficulties the two last named may be overcome and doubtless will be in large measure, as experience is accumulated.

" THE CLIMATIC DIFFICULTIES.

"The cotton crop in the Southwest is subject to the hazards of climate no less than in the eastern cotton belt. Cold weather in the early spring, rain that crusts the ground after the crop is planted, wind and hail during the growing season, excessively hot weather during the flowering period, an occasional water shortage during the critical months of late summer when the crop is making, and early autumn frosts make up a formidable array of hazards. Add to these plant lice and cotton stainers, with an occasional epidemic of 'black arm,' and there are surely troubles enough.

"Fortunately, however, it is unlikely that all these adversities will occur in any one season. And there is one outstanding advantage, the season of the cotton harvest is seldom rainy or windy, so that field damage is relatively slight.

"The season of 1920 was characterized by a cold, late spring, followed by a period of favorable growing weather which was in turn followed by a period of excessive heat. The first killing frost in the autumn did not come until near the end of November, except in the San Joaquin Valley, where a killing frost occurred on October 31.

"In other seasons there have been killing frosts in all the southwestern valleys as early in the fall as was the case in the San Joaquin Valley this year. When a killing frost occurs it stops the growth of the cotton plant, but it does not ordinarily injure the bolls that are nearly or quite mature, but have not yet opened. It is the usual thing for these bolls that are full-sized, but green at the time of frost, to burst open within a week or 10 days after the frost, so that the final picking can be made.

"In the San Joaquin Valley this season it was observed that the normal frost opening did not occur, particularly on the lower lands of the valley. On the higher lands the early frost was less severe, and the weather after the frost was drier and nearly normal frost-opening occurred. On the lower lands, however, fields seen a month after the frost showed very little frost-opening. A few bolls on the upper part of the plant had cracked at the tip but had not fluffed out so as to permit easy picking, while the bolls on the lower part of the plant where the bulk of the crop was borne had not cracked at all.

"In seeking an explanation of this phenomenon it was learned that the weather in the valley during November had been unusually humid. There had been a number of rainy and cloudy days, and also many days in which the morning fog had hung over the valley bottom until well into the middle of the day. The humidity record of the Weather Bureau station at Fresno shows that the month of November, 1920, was more humid than normal, while the same month in 1919 was less humid than normal. The significant data are given in the following table.

"Dry-bulb temperatures in degrees F., and relative humidity in per cent for November, 1919, and November, 1920, and the normal relative humidity for the month, as reported from the Weather Bureau station at Fresno, Calif. Station located 89 feet above the ground:

	Dry bulb.			Relative humidity, per cent.		
	5 a. m.	Local noon.	5 p. m.	5 a. m.	Local noon.	5 p. m.
November, 1919, mean November, 1920, mean Normal	43. 1 46. 9	61. 1 60. 1	62, 3 60. 0	59. 4 84. 4 78. 3	.35. 9 55. 7 49. 2	31. 5 57. 5 48. 0

"This delayed opening of the bolls was observed on both Pima and upland cotton, and if such conditions are found to be of frequent occurrence they may constitute a serious obstacle to the extension of cotton production in the lower part of the valley, where the cheaper land and cheaper irrigation water would otherwise favor such extension. This autumn humidity, if it proves to be a serious obstacle to cotton production, is the more to be regretted, because the climatic conditions of the summer appear to be particularly favorable to heavy fruiting of cotton. It has been observed that cotton plants of both types are more fruitful in the San Joaquin Valley than in the other valleys of the Southwest. They seem to produce more flowers and a larger proportion of the flowers develop into bolls than is the case in the other valleys.

"It is probable that this greater fruitfulness is associated with the less extreme summer temperatures, though other factors may be involved. It is clear that there is ordinarily much less boll shedding in the San Joaquin Valley than in the other southwestern valleys,

"BOLL SHEDDING.

"The flower of the cotton plant is borne at the node of a fruiting branch, the flower pedicle being attached to the node close to one side of axil of the leaf. When the plant is subjected to certain adverse conditions during the flowering period, the flower bud, the flower, or the young boll may be dropped off the plant by a process similar to that by which mature leaves are dropped from deciduous plants. This reaction is known as boll shedding, and is one of the chief causes of reduced yields in the Southwest. The exact cause of boll shedding is not yet definitely known. It is believed to result from a combination of high temperatures and a sudden change in the water supply available to the plant.

"It has been observed that upland cotton reacts more quickly to the conditions that cause shedding than Pima cotton, but, on the other hand, when these conditions become particularly severe the final loss to the Pima cotton is likely to be greater than to upland cotton. This may be explained by the capacity of the upland cotton to recover more quickly than Pima cotton and put on more fruit late in the season when conditions are more favorable.

"Boll shedding was so severe on Pima cotton in 1920 as to attract general attention. It is estimated that in some cases fully half the potential crop was lost in this way. In many fields the plants had practically no fruit on the lower branches, and the first few nodes on the branches near the middle of the

plant had lost their fruit.
"The outstanding characteristic of the Pima cotton in the San Joaquin Valley was that the fruit was held on the lower branches as well as on the upper ones. Though final maturity was checked by an early frost, the crop was on the plants. The plants in the San Joaquin Valley bore fruiting branches at the eighth or ninth node of the main stem, and these lower branches held their crop. In the Imperial and Salt River Val-leys, on the other hand, few plants bore fruiting branches below the sixteenth node, and often these lower branches were bare of fruit.

"There was sufficient uniformity in the plant reactions in the different valleys to indicate that climatic rather than cultural differences were primarily responsible. But there were sufficient differences from field to field in the same section to indicate that the adverse effect of climatic conditions could be minimized, to some extent at least, by the proper cultural Just what this proper cultural practice is remains to be determined. It is probably to be sought in the matter of irrigation. There is some reason for believing that if the irrigation water is so applied that the plants do not suffer for water during excessively hot weather in the flowering period the tendency to shed the fruit may be checked. There is probably a soil relationship as well-that is, a soil that is very permeable and has at the same time a relatively high water-holding capacity, so that the extremes of available moisture supply are less acute, may be found to have a restraining effect on boll shedding.

"If it should be found that more uniform soil moisture conditions during the flowering period actually offsets to some extent the injurious effects of very hot weather, it would be important to avoid overdoing the remedy. During the early years of Pima cotton production it was observed that farmers were inclined to give the crop too much water during the early period Too much irrigation early in the season appears to stimulate the vegetative growth of the plants at the expense of fruit production, and to increase also the difficulty of picking, because of the larger size of the plants. It may be possible to restrict irrigation early in the season before flowering time, thus checking excessive vegetative growth, and then irrigate frequently enough during the flowering and fruiting period, and particularly during the times of very hot weather, so as to check boll shedding, without forcing the plants into too much growth. Experiments to determine this point would seem to be well worth while; for, as the matter stands at present, boll shedding is a very serious factor in reducing yields in the irrigated Southwest, and cotton producers must find a way of getting larger yields if profitable crops are to be made under present economic conditions.

"COTTON PRODUCTION AND OTHER CROP INDUSTRIES.

"It is a well-recognized fact that cotton production can not be continued on the same land for an indefinite number of years without a decline in yield. It is not possible, however, to predict the rate of decline in any given case. On some land, naturally rich, the rate of decline would probably be slow. In some cases as many as eight successive crops have been grown with the last one showing no serious signs of distress. In other cases the second or third successive crop has shown a marked decline

in productivity.

"When cotton was first proposed as a crop for the Southwest it was thought that in case it proved profitable it might come to occupy as much as 25 per cent or even 30 per cent of the cropped land. With this proportion of the land in cotton it was thought that a satisfactory system of crop rotation could be worked out, including alfalfa, grain, and truck crops. The profitable production of grain and alfalfa in the irrigated Southwest presupposes the feeding of live stock on the farms, for these commodities are too bulky to justify long shipment to market. Live-stock production, in itself ordinarily profitable, also gives a by-product of farm manure which if used on cotton land greatly increases

"The abnormal prices for cotton during and since the war have stimulated cotton production to such an extent that in the Salt River Valley at least the cotton acreage in 1920 was nearly equal to the combined acreage of all other crops. It is hardly to be expected that such a large proportion of the land in this valley will be put in cotton again in the near future. Already plans are being made to put some of the cotton land back into

alfalfa and more of it will doubtless go into grain sorghums next summer. But such crops are profitable only if fed to live stock on or near the project, and at the present time the live stock population of the Salt River Valley is not large enough to consume much more alfalfa and grain than is now grown.

"The obvious need for the welfare of that valley is to increase its live-stock population, but that is another story.

"The present discussion of cotton in relation to other crop industries may be limited to pointing out two important considerations, namely, these other industries should be profitable in themselves and not used solely or too largely as a means of maintaining cotton yields and thus stand, in a measure, as an expense against the cotton crop; and cotton can not be grown continuously and profitably under conditions where its essential associated crops, such as alfalfa and grain, can not be grown at a profit on their own account. This second consideration is intended to apply to those sections where, because of recent high prices, cotton production has been undertaken with land and water costs so high that the production of alfalfa and grain is conceded to be out of the question.

"SYNDICATED COTTON PRODUCTION.

"The term 'syndicated production' is used here in reference to large scale production operations, whether individual, partnership, or corporate, as to management. When a single organization operates several thousand acres, all or chiefly in a crop like cotton, it has to deal with problems which differ in important espects from those of a farmer operating 100 acres or less. In the irrigated Southwest there are a number of cases where as much as 5,000 acres and even 10,000 acres of land is operated

under a single management.

"There is, of course, nothing very unusual in this so far as size alone is concerned; the unusual feature lies in the fact that almost without exception those who are managing these large producing enterprises have had no previous experience or training in such work. Some of them may have had some farming experience and some of them have had experience in large-scale operations in other lines, but for most of them, if not for all of them, large-scale cotton production is a new experience. The remarkable thing, then, about these syndicated enterprises is not that serious mistakes and miscalculations have been made in their management, but that they have been even passably successful.

"These syndicated production enterprises, particularly those inaugurated by interests associated with the manufacture or use of cotton, have served one very useful purpose: They have given the farmers and bankers of the Southwest confidence in the ultimate stability of the market for cotton. These farmers and bankers, some of whom were at first skeptical as to whether there would be a satisfactory and continuing market for cotton, saw no further occasion for doubt on this point when the ultimate consumer began to invest large sums of money in produc-

"There is no very obvious reason why cotton can not be produced on a large scale nearly or quite as efficiently and economically as on a small scale. But this can not be done if the large-scale producer does not know or disregards the fundamental agronomic or economic principles of cotton farming. Without undertaking to formulate all these fundamental principles, the following may be set down as among the more important for the cases under consideration:

"1. The average cotton farm is not very profitable and the large enterprise must get better than average yields at little if any more than average production costs if it is to return a

profit on the investment.

2. Expensive overhead costs must be avoided and labor must

be continuously and effectively employed.

"3. Cotton must be grown in rotation with other crops if yields are to be maintained and labor and equipment effectively utilized.

"4. The other crops grown in connection with cotton for purposes of rotation must be so produced and utilized as to return t least a small profit on their own account and not stand as a liability against the cotton crop.

"5. The whole operation should be so conceived and conducted as to pay a reasonable return on the investment over a period of years and not so as to have to look for ultimate profit

to an increase in land values.

"It may be urged that most of the actual profits that have been made in American farming have been derived from the progressive increase in land prices and not from the difference between production cost and crop returns. But it would be unsound economies to hold that the increase in land prices can go on indefinitely. There is reason for believing that in some sections of the country it has already gone too far.

"There may be a justification for syndicated cotton production when undertaken by cotton manufacturers which would not hold for others. This lies in the fact that certain users of cotton have such specialized requirements and their needs are so exigent that they can not afford to depend for their supplies of raw material on the hazards of a fluctuating market or the whims of a group of farmers who may change from one kind of cotton to another in a season or two. In such a case the cotton manufacturer might be justified in undertaking to produce all, or at least a large part, of the cotton he required, not so much because he could hope to do so cheaper than it could be done by farmers but because he could thereby reduce the hazards of his business.

"RELATIONS OF MANUFACTURERS TO COTTON PRODUCERS.

"One of the outstanding features of cotton production in the United States has been that cotton manufacturers have not maintained close relationships with cotton producers. Until recent years the two were completely separated geographically, cotton manufacturing being done almost wholly in New England or overseas. Within the last few years a number of cotton-manufacturing plants have been built in the South, but even these are quite as likely to draw their supplies of cotton from distant parts of the cotton belt as from near by.

"The producers of cotton and the users of the raw material have had almost no direct dealings with each other. The gap has been bridged by an elaborate system of middlemen. These middlemen have served, and doubtless continue to serve, many useful purposes, but they have also acted as a very effective insulation between the producers and manufacturers of cotton. It is very largely because of this insulation that the special needs and the ultimate discriminations of the manufacturers have been so slow in finding their way back to the producer.

"While the manufacturers of cotton have not maintained direct relationships with the producer, the manufacturers of cottonseed products have taken a different course. They have built their plants in the very midst of the cotton fields, and in many cases have built and operated ginning plants for the use of the farmers. Through these ginning plants the seed manufacturers have been able to establish direct relations with the producer. They have largely determined the kind of cotton that should be planted, because they have had planting seed to sell, and they have in many cases acted as the agents through whom the farmer secured credit for the production of his crop. Because of this advantage of position the cottonseed-oil man has been in position to influence the farmer in certain important matters. Were it to his interest to do so, he might exert a powerful influence in such matters as clean picking and better baling.

"This important advantage of position has only recently been appreciated by a few cotton manufacturers. These have begun, particularly in the Southwest, to establish gins, to furnish planting seed, to provide credit for growing the crop, and in some cases to contract in advance for the lint produced. This course of procedure may come to be regarded as an alternative to syndicated production. It has the advantage of being cheaper to undertake and of being less likely to result in serious

"The service of establishing and operating a cotton-ginning plant and providing of credit for crop production partakes somewhat of the character and involves some of the responsibilities of a public service. Because of that fact, persons thus engaged are in a measure subject to public regulation, and unless the business is conducted in a satisfactory manner it will not be possible to exercise much influence through such agencies. If a cotton manufacturer aims to use these agencies as a means of obtaining a fairly constant supply of a certain type of cotton, he must so conduct them as to retain the confidence and good will of his patrons. This should not be a very difficult matter, particularly if he is prepared to operate this part of his business at a small profit or even at a small loss in order to provide himself with a continuing supply of cotton. Probably the most important feature of such an arrangement as the one outlined is the opportunity to provide cotton growers with planting seed. The kind of seed planted very largely determines the kind of cotton obtained, and it is upon the proper management of the ginning business that the purity and value of the seed supply depends.

"SEED SUPPLIES.

"Certain differences between Pima cotton and the upland varieties grown in the Southwest have already been mentioned. None of these differences is more marked than is the contrast as regards seed supply. Ever since Pima cotton was first grown in the Salt River Valley the matter of maintaining the purity of the seed has been given most serious consideration. A group

of farmers organized under the somewhat inappropriate name of the Tempe Cotton Exchange has assumed responsible leadership in supervising the production and distribution of planting seed. They have operated one 10-stand gin at Tempe, which has ginned only cotton from selected fields intended to supply seed. The seed is delinted and bagged at the gin and stored in a concrete warehouse. Each bag of seed is stamped with the variety name and the association mark, and it is now planned to ticket each bag with a certificate of inspection provided by the county agent.

"The records of field production of the seed supply are so handled that each bag of seed bears a number which shows when that particular stock of seed was inspected in the field to insure its purity. The system of field roguing and inspection has been described in detail elsewhere and need not be further mentioned here. During the past two seasons it has been necessary for the Southwest Cotton Co. to assist the Tempe Exchange in ginning and storing the seed supply. The capacity of the exchange gin is only about two and a half million pounds of seed, which has not been enough to supply the demand in the Salt River Valley and the other sections of the Southwest. In the spring of 1920 the demand for seed was so great that all of the pure seed was used for the first planting. The spring weather was cold and more than the usual replanting was required. As a result it was necessary to use some seed that had been run into oil-mill warehouses. Although this oil-mill seed was all grown locally, and therefore reasonably pure, there was enough seed in it of hybrid origin so that hybrid and off-type plants could be seen in every field in which it was used. year's experience is a striking demonstration of the importance of guarding the seed supply continuously, even in a community where no other type of cotton is grown.

"It is hard to describe the seed supply situation in the upland cotton districts. There have been supplies of pure seed in these sections in time past. There was at one time a large supply of Durango seed and shipments of pure seed of other varieties have been brought in from time to time. These stocks have been so effectively mixed at the gins that it is now almost impossible to distinguish them. This mixture of varieties would be much less serious if it were possible to bring in new supplies of seed, but the danger of insect invasion is so great that it has been necessary to prohibit the westward movement of seed.

"The effect of this general mixture of the upland varieties has been shown both in decreased yields and in reduced prices for the lint. For several years the upland cotton from the irrigated Southwest sold at a premium over similar eastern cotton because of its bright color. Recently, however, there has been a pronounced tendency to discriminate against it because of the irregularity in length of staple, despite its better grade.

"If there is to be maintained a continuing production of upland cotton in the Southwest it seems clear that some provision must be made to produce locally a supply of better planting seed than that now available. In fact, it would seem that one of the best reasons for continuing to grow upland cotton on high-priced irrigated land would be found in the production of pure stocks of planting seed to ship to the main cotton belt. One of the serious problems in the east is that in wet seasons the seed loses its vitality before planting time. In this respect the seed from the dry western valleys would have a very great advantage.

"FINANCING AND MARKETING THE CROP.

"It may be assumed from the figures given in preceding pages that the cotton crop of the irrigated Southwest in 1920 will turn out about 120,000 bales of Pima cotton, about 160,000 bales of upland cotton, and about 170,000 tons of seed, and that the production and harvesting of this crop up to the time it is ready for market will involve the use of money or credit to the sum of about \$50,000,000. This money or credit is chiefly supplied through the local banks.

"In the case of the Salt River Valley alone the total investment in the production and harvesting of the Pima crop must be not less than \$20,000,000. The bank resources of Phoenix, the financial center of the valley, were reported in the recent census as \$27,500,000. Clearly the financing of the production of the cotton crop is among the most important of the problems of the Phoenix bankers. The daily interest charge on the money invested in the Salt River Valley cotton crop this year is something over \$4,000. With the turn of the year new calls must be met for funds for the next season's operations and other crops and industries demand credit accommodations, for only about half the acreage of the valley is devoted to cotton. The 1920 cotton crop must be placed on another credit basis,

"In the last two or three seasons the cotton crop was much smaller in amount, if not much less in aggregate value, and buyers from the east were bidding for it actively as it came from the gins. This season buyers are holding off. Some cotton has been consigned to eastern points on credit advances ranging from \$175 per bale down to \$100 per bale for Pima. These advances were not sufficient, in some cases at least, to release the cotton from the obligations already made against it. This situation was rapidly becoming serious in the latter part of November and continues so. It is receiving, as it deserves, the serious attention of the best minds in the community, and in this, as in other difficulties that have been met and overcome, there is a spirit of community action and community confidence that is indomitable.

"In conclusion it may be said that while the production of cotton under irrigation in the Southwest has scarcely yet passed beyond the experimental stage, it has been given a fair trial. The present indications are that it will be continued, though probably on a reduced scale, for the next few years. The experiment has gone far enough to demonstrate that good cotton can be grown, that varietal purity and high quality of product can be maintained where proper attention is given to the matter of seed supplies. At present it is doubtful if there is another crop that could be extensively substituted for cotton that would give

better returns for the labor and capital invested.'

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.
Mr. McKELLAR. I notice that the Senator's amendment is

to increase the duty on cotton 20 per cent.

Mr. ASHURST. The amendment proposes to increase the Mr. ASHURST.

duty from 7 cents a pound to 20 cents a pound.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I am informed that the provision of the bill making the duty applicable only to cotton having a staple of 13 inches or more in length will exclude but very little Egyptian cotton; that the greater part of the Egyptian cotton that comes to this country now has a staple of less than 1s inches in length. If that is true, it would be immaterial what the tariff is on cotton if the length of staple covered by the bill is so great that Egyptian cotton would not be

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is correct. On this point I now read again from the Government publication entitled "Cot-

ton Production in Southwest:"

This variety-

That is, our southwestern cotton grown on irrigated landproduces a fiber 13 to 15 inches in length.

I introduced an amendment to the emergency tariff bill last February proposing to strike out the fraction "three-eighths" and insert "one-eighth," so that if the bill should pass the cotton growers of the Southwest, who were so distressed, might obtain some relief. I voted for the bill in the vain hope that the psychological effect might be of some value to the cotton growers, but it would have been practically of no benefit, first, because the duty was too low and, secondly, because the figures " $1\frac{1}{3}$ " should have read " $1\frac{1}{3}$ " or " $1\frac{1}{2}$."

Mr. McKellar. One and one-eighth would be better. A great deal of cotton similar to that which is raised in the Senator's State is raised in the Mississippi Delta just below where I live, and a great deal is also produced in Florida, some in South Carolina, and probably in other portions of the country to a small extent; but none of this long-staple cotton will be benefited in any way if the 1½-inch provision is permitted to remain in the bill. It would make no difference how high the tariff duty is on it if no Egyptian cotton were kept

ASHURST. The production of sea-island cotton last year dwindled to 1,725 bales-400-pound bales, I believe. The length of fiber as at present prescribed in the bill might give some relief to the growers of those 1,725 bales; that would be about all.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will state that, having in view the contention made by the Senator from Tennessee, I have proposed an amendment to make the length of staple 11 inches instead of 13 inches. I have an amendment of that kind pending.

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield further, as I understand the situation, the present wording of this bill is unimportant in so far as long-staple cotton produced in the United States is concerned, for long-staple cotton will be admitted under the terms of

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. My understanding is that practically no Egyptian cotton is of 18-inch staple.

Mr. ASHURST. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The great body of the Egyptian cotton that comes over here under the law as it is now has a staple less than 13 inches in length, and, therefore, the pending bill would not affect it.

Mr. ASHURST. In other words, the Senator makes the point that with the figures as they are no relief would be granted

Mr. McKELLAR. Substantially no relief would be granted at all. Unless the provision shall be changed the cotton producers may as well understand that they will get no relief under

Mr. ASHURST. Let me repeat on that very point that in the last Congress I introduced an amendment changing the figures from 1% to 1%, but, while the amendment was adopted in the Senate, it was defeated in conference.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield; yes, sir.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Did I understand the Senator to say a

moment ago that there are about 1,700 bales of cotton raised in this country which would be protected by the 1%-inch provision?

Mr. ASHURST. I must make myself clear, and I will an-

swer the Senator in this way.

Sea-island cotton-which is grown on the coast of the Carolinas and Florida, on the islands near the coast-is of a long staple or long fiber. In 1915 there were produced of that variety 111,716 bales. The next year, 1916, there were produced 117,559 bales. In 1917 there were produced 92,619 bales. In 1918 there were produced 52,208 bales. In 1919 there were produced only 6.916 bales. In 1920 the production of sea-island cotton shrank to 1,725 bales. I believe these are 400-pound In other words, in five years, from a production of 111,716 bales, sea-island cotton production shrank to 1,725 bales. This sea-island production was practically wiped out, but hundreds of thousands of bales of long-staple cotton have been pouring in from Egypt, which, of course, enters directly into competition with the Pima or Arizona Egyptian cotton.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of what length of staple is the sea-island cotton the production of which has dwindled to 1,700 bales-1\$

inches or greater?

Mr. ASHURST. I should not say it was greater. Some of it is not much greater, but it ranges from 11 to 19.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the Senator attribute the dwindling of that industry to the absence of protection?

Mr. ASHURST. No. That was caused by the boll weevil.
Mr. WOLCOTT. There must be some other cause, because it is common knowledge that in 1920, the year of smallest production, cotton prices were perhaps higher than ever before in history, and back in those other years when the production was so great that they were able to make money on a much lower price for the cotton.

Mr. ASHURST. I believe this dwindling of the production of sea-island cotton has been brought about by the boll weevil.

Am I correct in that?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been so informed. I call the Senator's attention to paragraph 17 of the bill, which puts a tariff of 7 cents per pound on the manufactured goods.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we are correct about Egyptian cotton being prevented from coming in under section 16, that would mean that we are putting a tariff on the manufactures of Egyptian cotton to the absolute exclusion of American cotton.

Mr. ASHURST. That is one of the quarrels I have with the bill. After proposing to place a duty of 7 cents per pound on the raw material, we find that the manufacturers are going to absorb the benefit of it, because the very next paragraph, as the Senator points out, reads:

Manufactures of which cotton of the kind provided for in paragraph 16 is the component material of chief value, 7 cents per pound, in addition to the rates of duty imposed thereon by existing law.

Of course, we should move to strike out that paragraph, otherwise the bill would simply be for the benefit of the manu-

facturers instead of the producers.

Mr. President, I shall now read from a brief submitted to the chairman of the subcommittee on cotton of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. This brief was prepared by Mr. Dwight B. Heard, of Phoenix, Ariz., who represented the Chamber of Commerce and the Cotton Growers Association, and it is so clear and so complete, with material facts and data, that I am sure Senators who are interested in this subject will be enlightened. It is addressed to Hon. WILLIAM R. GREEN, chairman subcommittee on cotton, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, and is as

Hon. WILLIAM R. GREEN,

Chairman Subcommittee on Cotton,

Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

Sir: Availing of your suggestion that I present in concise form a statement in behalf of the needs of the producers of American Egyptian cotton, I present the following:

STATEMENT BY DWIGHT B. HEARD, OF PHOENIX, ARIZ., REPRESENTING
THE ARIZONA EGYPTIAN COTTON GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, THE PHOENIX
(ARIZ.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AND THE PHOENIX CLEARING HOUSE
ASSOCIATION, AS TO THE NEED OF A PROTECTIVE TARIFF ON AMERICAN
EGYPTIAN OR PIMA LONG-STAPLE COTTON.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.

The American Egyptian or Pima long-staple cotton industry, which during the past 15 years has developed as an essential national industry, now faces destruction through competition with cotton of similar type produced by the present labor of Egypt on a present wage scale of 40 cents per day for a 12-hour

day.

This Egyptian long-staple cotton is now being laid down at New England spinning points at 26 cents per pound, almost exactly one-half the estimated production cost of last year's exactly one-half the estimated production cost of last year's American Egyptian crop, as per a report recently furnished

Congress by Mr. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture. In the season of 1919-20, 485,000 bales of Egyptian cotton were imported into the United States as compared with an average importation for the previous five years of 202,000 bales. It is conservatively estimated that 70 per cent of this importation was Sakellaridis cotton, the type principally used for the manufacture of tire yarns and with which the American-grown Egyptian cotton comes in direct competition.

The standard of living of the Egyptian peasants who furnish the labor in the cotton fields of Egypt is vastly inferior to an American standard of living. This peasant labor is exceptionally efficient. These Egyptian laborers at the price of 40 cents per day work from sunrise to sunset, while in Arizona, where 85 per cent of the American Egyptian crop is grown, the cost of field labor for a 9-hour day in 1920 was \$3. It is estimated that in 1921 this will be reduced to \$2-still more than five times as large as the Egyptian wage, in view of the shorter

hours in Arizona.

It is conservatively estimated that one-third of the cost of the production of long-staple cotton is involved in the picking. The cost of picking cotton in Egypt in 1920, according to the best information available, was less than \$10 per 500-pound bale; while in Arizona the cost of picking the same size bale was \$80. This situation presents an intolerable condition which can only be remedied by the reasonable protection asked. Officials of the United States Department of Agriculture have recently estimated that the cost of producing American Egyptian Pima cotton in Arizona in 1920, on the basis of a yield of half bale to the acre, was 52.6 cents. The attached statements from well-informed Arizona growers show an estimated average cost of production in 1921 of approximately 41 cents. According to the most recent market quotations, Old World Egyptian cotton of the Sakellaridis variety, the type which most nearly corresponds to the America Pima, and which comprises about 70 per cent of the import from Egypt, is being laid down in New Bed-ford for 26 cents per pound. The duty asked for by American producers to maintain this industry on a living basis is but 20 cents per pound. It is evident that unless the relief asked for through a protective tariff is promptly granted the industry built up through 20 years' cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture faces destruction.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN EGYPTIAN COTTON.

Pima cotton was originated and developed by the Department of Agriculture as a result of plant-breeding work carried on in Arizona since 1902. A strikingly superior individual plant, selected in 1910 at the Government experimental station at Sacaton on the Pima Indian Reservation in southern Arizona. was the parent of the Pima variety, of which 250,000 acres were grown in 1920 in Arizona and California. It is an interesting conincidence that the plant which gave rise to the Sakellaridis variety, the principal competitor of Pima, was discovered in Egypt in the same year, 1910.

Pima cotton can be successfully grown only on the irrigated lands of southern Arizona and California, where the climatic and soil conditions have proven to be exceptionally favorable for the growth of this type, which is not adapted to conditions

in the eastern cotton belt.

The Pima cotton has an average length of staple of 15 inches and is maintained in a high state of uniformity by careful seed ment of Agriculture. It is used in the manufacture of fine dress goods, hosiery, and sewing thread; but principally in automobile-tire fabrics. It is estimated that 80 per cent of the Pima crop in recent years has been used for this last purpose. In all these classes of manufacture the American-grown Egyptian cotton is in direct competition with Sakellaridis cotton imported from Egypt.

DECLINING SEA-ISLAND PRODUCTION MAKES PIMA ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE.

During the recent war exhaustive Government tests showed that the Pima cotton was a thoroughly satisfactory substitute for sea-island cotton in the manufacture of airplane wings and balloon cloth, and during the last year of the war large quantities of cloth were manufactured from Pima cotton and successfully used in the air work. The first tests of Pima cotton for this work were made at the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture, which pointed out that with the rapid advance of the boll weevil the sea-island crop might be suddenly wiped out and that a substitute must be found if possible in an American-grown cotton. Since Arizona and California are well isolated from the boll-weevil district and were already producing a cotton of extra long staple and great uniformity, which was known to be capable of substitution for sea-island. an extension of Pima cotton growing in that region appeared to be a military necessity, and for that reason was especially encouraged by the Department of Agriculture in the war period. The figures given in the table showing the production of seaisland and American-Egyptian cottons during the last five years make it clear that the Department of Agriculture was thoroughly justified in calling attention to the necessity of a substitute for sea-island cotton, which now has almost disappeared from cultivation. If the war had been prolonged even for another year the Pima cotton would have become the sole reliance for this vital purpose.

Partly as a result of stimulation by the Government during the war the acreage of Pima cotton has been greatly expanded during the past two years, and with the sudden slump in the market in 1920 the growers have been left with fully 90 per cent of their last crop unsold. The danger is very great that unless adequate protection is furnished against the competition of cheaply grown foreign cotton this highly specialized cotton, which recent experience has shown to be essential to the na-

tional defense, will disappear.

With the sea-island cotton practically gone, this country would be entirely dependent on foreign sources of supply.

Statement of the production of Pima and sea-island cottons, in balcs, during the past 5 years.

Year.	American Egyptian or Pima. ¹	Sea island.
1918	3,331 15,966 40,343 42,374 91,965	117, 559 92, 619 52, 208 6, 916 1, 725

1 500-pound bales.

2 400-pound bales.

Estimated imports of Sakellaridis Egyptian cotton in equivalent 500-pound bales during the past five years.

Year, (500	
1915-1916	204,000
1917–1918	80,000
1919–1920	340,000

COST OF PRODUCTION.

In a very carefully prepared statement recently issued by Mr. C. S. Scofield, of the United States Department of Agriculture, based on a yield of a half bale to the acre in the Salt River Valley of Arizona, where about 85 per cent of the Pima cotton is produced, a production cost is shown for the season of 1920 of 52.6 cents per pound. Owing to reductions which have already occurred in the price of field labor and estimated reductions which are anticipated in the cost of picking and ginning Pima cotton for next season, it is estimated that the cost of production in 1921 on the basis of a half bale to the acre will be at least 42 cents.

It will be observed that if the 20 cents per pound tariff asked for is added to the present delivered price of Egyptian Sakellaridis cotton in New England the American grower would make only a very small profit above cost of production. It is hoped by this legislation to stabilize the price of American-Egyptian Pima cotton so as to justify continuing the American industry selection, under the supervision of the United States Depart- based on a price of approximately 50 cents to the producer.

The attached statements, Exhibits A, B, and C, of estimated cost of production in the Salt River Valley of Arizona for 1921, made by Mr. W. S. Stevens, president of the Arizona American-Egyptian Cotton Growers' Association, Mr. Charles M. Smith, a grower who keeps exceptionally accurate records, and the writer, who has grown this type of cotton for the past five years, are presented for the purpose of giving detailed estimates as to the cost of production for 1921.

On the Salt River Valley reclamation project in Arizona 186,000 acres were farmed in Pima cotton in 1920, on which a crop of seventy-two thousand 500-pound bales was produced. Confronted as they have been during the recent months with a price for this cotton far below its cost of production, the majority of the producers, through the assistance of the banks, have held on to their cotton, anticipating a relief from the existing situation, and it is estimated that 67,000 bales of this crop still remain in the hands of the producers. This situation illustrates the urgent need for immediate relief.

The emergency tariff bill, as passed by the House of Representatives on April 15, 1921, and now before the Committee of Finance of the Senate, in paragraph 16 contains the following clause as to the protective duty on long-staple cotton:

Cotton having a staple of 11 inches or more in length, 7 cents per pound.

It is evident that the above is not adequate to protect this industry on the basis of American standards of living. In the report of April 13, 1921, in connection with the emergency tariff bill, on page 20, the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture definitely recommends a duty of not less than 10 cents per pound, making the following statements:

10 cents per pound, making the following statements:

(4) Large areas of land in this country are available for the production of extra staple cotton, but because of the costs of reclamation, irrigation, and the higher standards of living and cost of labor, the cost of production of such cotton in the United States is high and our producers need a protective tariff to equalize the cost of production abroad with that in the United, States.

(6) In the table following are presented quotations on the selling price of Sakellaridis Egyptian and American Egyptian cottons. It will be observed that on March 15 the price of fully good Sakellaridis was 35% cents and good fair Sakellaridis 26% cents, c. i. f., landed Boston, and that American Egyptian cotton of No. 2 grade was quoted at 26% cents, and No. 3 grade at 25% cents, landed Boston. Such prices are far below the estimated cost of production of cotton in Arizona and California. It should be further pointed out that from the table the prices of good fair Sakellaridis and No. 2 Arizona Egyptian have been practically identical since November 13 last. In other words, the price of good fair Sakellaridis seems to fix the price of American Egyptian cotton.

* **

(9) Producers of long-staple cotton have faced adverse market conditions in the sale of last year's crop and are said to have on hand a large part of last year's production. Accordingly, it is believed that the producer would receive the benefit of whatever protection that might be conferred by the proposed tariff measure.

I am presenting the foregoing statement at the request of the

I am presenting the foregoing statement at the request of the Arizona American Egyptian Cotton Growers' Association, the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, and the Clearing House Association of Phoenix, whose letters in this connection are attached herewith. In this statement I have endeavored to present figures and facts as to this industry whose existence is so seriously threatened, and in view of the fact that through some misunderstanding the producers of American-Egyptian cotton had no opportunity to present their case before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House I trust opportunity may be found before the emergency bill passes the Senate to increase the duty on long-staple cotton from 7 cents to the 20 cents so urgently needed.

Very respectfully,

DWIGHT B. HEARD.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., April 25, 1921.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD also the Exhibits A, B, and C attached to the communication.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A.

ARIZONA AMERICAN-EGYPTIAN COTTON GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,

Phoenix, Ariz., April 14, 1921.

Mr. Dwight B. Heard,

Phoenix, Ariz.

My Dear Mr. Heard:

There is such a wide difference in the ideas of rental values that I have eliminated this altogether, considering a man that is working on payment of one-fourth of his crop as rent. I have eliminated, as far as possible, the question of diversified farming, in that a portion of the crops produced might be used in feeding and caring for the stock of the grower. I am taking as a basis an exceptionally good man with an exceptionally good team, and giving him all the land that such a man can possibly handle under favorable circumstances, which is 50 acres. I am considering that this man and his one team must do all the work of preparing and planting, cultivating, supervising, picking, and deliver the cotton to the gin. In handling this acreage, he will have no time whatever to do any hoeing or irrigating. This is pro-

vided in moderate charges. We have considered the cost of picking on the prewar basis, which is really less than it should be when we consider the fact that shoes are 100 per cent more than four years ago, and that provisions and clothing have not anywhere near been reduced to prewar basis.

This man and his team are allowed \$1,200 for the year. Out of this \$1,200 the man's only living expense, or his wage and feed for his team, are all included. This man and his team is far above the average in being thoroughly able to cultivate and handle 50 acres of land, but I am considering the average yield to be the actual average being produced in our valley since Pima cotton has been introduced, which has been one-half bale per acre. Of course, we have exceptional cases where people may average better than one-half bale for several years, but this is offset wherein just as many farmers produce less than one-half bale for the same period of time, because they are liable to the losses incurred from hail storms, black arm, root rot, and other troubles; so that, on the whole, I think that this is a very conservative estimate of the average cost for the year 1921:

A man and team, one year \$1,200.00

A man and team, one year	81 000 00
Irrigation water, at \$3.75 per acre	187. 50
Planting seed, \$1 per acre	50, 00
Hoeing, including thinning, at \$7 per acre	350, 00
Totalis, including turning, at or per acre	
Expense of irrigation, \$3 per acre	150.00
Implements, \$250, depreciation only	50.00
Shopwork	25, 00
Incidentals, including sacks, tents, etc	100, 00
Incidentals, including sacks, tents, etc.	
Ginning 25 baies, at \$20	50000
Ginning 25 bales, at \$20 Picking 25 bales, at 8 cents per pound	1, 500. 00
	A TOTAL PROPERTY.
	4, 112, 50
Total, less 111 tons of seed, at \$20	225, 00
Total cost of 18% bales, 6% having been paid as rent	3, 887. 50
Cost per pound	413

EXHIBIT B.

APRIL 24, 1921.

W. S. STEVENS.

Mr. Dwight B. Heard, Phoenix, Ariz.

Very truly,

DEAR MR. HEARD: The following is my estimate of the cost of production of Pima cotton in the Salt River Valley for 1921:

ESTIMATED COST OF PRODUCTION, 80 ACRES COTTON, SEASON 1921.

Based on low wage scale of \$3 per day, including board—cheap horse feed, but no allowance for horses when not actually employed, nor for man when he is not actually in field.

not for man when he is not getting in here.	
Plowing, at \$3.75 per acre	\$300
Disking after plowing, at 80 cents per acre	64
Dragging twice, at \$2	160
	54
Disking before planting, at 80 cents	64 56
Planting, at 70 cents per acre	56
Cultipacker, at 50 cents per acre	
Cultivating about 8 times, including furrowing out, at 70 cents_	448
Chopping, at \$1.25 per acre	100
Hoeing twice, at \$1.50 per acre	
Labor, irrigation, 4 times after planting	60
Planting seed	40
Depreciation in equipment	150 250
Incidental expenses	
	400
Taxes, State and county, at \$5 per acre	400
Petimetal cost to picking time	9 090
Dishing hosts I halo nor earn at 2 cents nor nound	9 400
Overboad including tents sacks wood insurance hauling cotton	300
	600
	Plowing, at \$3.75 per acre

Total as above______Actual cost of production (labor only), 34 cents per pound. IMPORTANT NOTE: The above does not include any land rent or interest on land investment—does not allow anything for living expenses while farmer is not in field—nothing for ditch cleaning, keeping up fences, etc. On the above basis 45 cents per pound would mean ultra-conservative cost of production, 1921.

CHAS, M. SMITH.

6, 826

EXHIBIT C.

APRIL 21, 1921.

Estimate of Dwight B. Heard, of Phoenix, Ariz., as to cost of production of American-Egyptian (Pima) cotton, under the Salt River reclamation project, Arizona; for season of 1921, cost per acre based on production of one-half bale to an acre and present cost of labor and supplies.

Annual payment to United States Government due on Roose-	00 00	
velt Dam and Salt River Valley project	\$2.00	
Taxes on basis average assessed on location \$183 per acre and average combined State, county, school, high school, and		
road district tax rate of \$2.50	4.57	
Irrigation water service based on annual use of 3 acre-feet Seed for planting, select Government-inspected seed at 2 cents	3, 60	
per pound 30 pounds per acre	. 60	
Labor for irrigating once before plowing, six times after plow-	0.40	
ing, at 30 cents per acre	2, 10	
Plowing, per acre	4. 50	
Harrowing twice at \$1	2. 00	
Dragging twice at \$1	2.00	
Planting	. 75	
Rolling	. 75	
Seven cultivations, including furrowing out	5. 60 1. 25	
Average summer hoeing, cost per acre	7. 50	
		i

Expense per acre to picking time_____ 37, 22

. 3149

, 3949

Picking 1,000 pounds seed cotton, equaling one-half bale of lint at 3 cents per pound \$30.00 (Sinning one-half bale cotton at \$20	
	47. 50
	84. 72
Deduct value of cotton seed, 750 pounds to each 1,900 pounds of seed cotton at value of \$16 per ton	6.00
Net cost of producing one-half bale or 250 pounds of Pima long-staple cotton lint per acre	78. 72
Cost per pound Pima lint cotton exclusive of any return en	. 3149
Figuring a revenue on the land of but \$20 per acre would add	.011
8 cents to production cost of lint cotton and make the actual production cost per pound of Pima cotton lint	. 3941

[Copy.]

Hon. J. W. Fordney, Chairman Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: From the standpoint of safeguarding the financial interests of the Salt River Valley of Arizona, the Phoenix Clearing House Association is vitally interested in the proposal to enact a protective tariff on American Egyptian Pima long-staple cotton. This is a special type of cotton developed by the United States Department of Agriculture through an experimental stage of 12 years or more, and which has become known to the cotton trade at large as the equal of any cotton in the world. This type of cotton has been extensively used for the manufacture of tire fabric on account of its superior length of staple and high tensile strength.

Last year in the Salt River Valley 185,000 acres were planted to long-staple cotton with a resulting yield of more than 72,000 bales. Estimates place the cost of last year's crop at about 60 cents per pound.

Estimates place the cost of last year's crop at about 60 cents per pound.

No general market has so far developed for the staple, and the few sales made during recent weeks have ranged from 24 to 30 cents per pound, basis No. 2.

Salt River Valley is especially adapted to the growing of long-staple cotton; the cultivation of this staple is restricted to a few valleys in the Southwest, where the length of the growing season permits the development of the fiber and general cultural conditions are favorable. It seems important that some steps be taken to insure the permanence of this new industry in the Southwest, which is just beginning to supply a growing demand for this superior type of cotton.

In order that the industry may survive the growers of Arizona and California need the benefit of a protective tariff of a sufficient amount to enable them to compete with Egyptian Sakellarides cotton, produced in Egypt by native labor on a wage scale entirely out of harmony with the American standard of living.

The Phoenix Clearing House Association, in special meeting, hereby carnestly advocates the adoption of a protective tariff on American Egyptian Pima long-staple cotton of 20 cents per pound.

Mr. Dwight B. Heard, representing the Arizona American Egyptian Cotton Growers' Association and the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, will appear before your committee in behalf of the foregoing proposal. Mr. Heard is fully qualified to speak for the cotton growers of the Southwest, and we bespeak for him your most favorable consideration.

Yours, respectfully.

The Phoenix Clearing House Association, By B. E. Moore, Vice President.

[Copy.]

THE PHOENIX CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, Phoenix, Ariz., April 14, 1921.

Hon. Dwight B. Heard, Heard Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

My Dear Mr. Heard: We are glad to have you represent the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, with a membership of 1,100, at any and all meetings held in Washington in connection with the tariff or any other subject vital to this section of the Southwest.

This is to advise that you have been appointed as the general official representative of this organization at the board of directors' meeting held to-day, April 14.

Yours, very truly,

W. W. Lawhon,

President

W. W. LAWHON,
President.
HARRY WELCH,
Secretary.

Mr. ASHURST. I know how dry and unattractive statistics are, but I have confidence that Senators will peruse at least some of the statistics, and Senators ought to read them before they vote on the cotton schedule. Before I conclude, however, let me put these figures in juxtaposition before Senators. I will be very brief.

This Egyptian cotton is being imported into the United States at the time when the farmers are trying to build up this longstaple cotton industry, at the very time our farmers are working in a sun which blazes down sometimes at 115 degrees and sometimes at 120 degrees, working in competition with the Egyptian laborer, who, as I have said in the Senate heretofore, works 12 hours, and has since Cambyses came in from Persia, 2,500 years ago, and subjugated Egypt, been possessed of physical efficiency that is one of the phenomena of the world; the Egyptian fellahin works 12 hours in that hot climate. Our people in the Southwest have gone into competition with them and have tried to build up this industry. But unless some relief be

granted thousands of Americans, who believed their Government at least would extend to them the same measure of consideration it extends to the Egyptian, will be driven to failure.

In 1911 there were imported from Egypt into the United States 183,786 bales of cotton. The United States took 12 per cent of the Egyptian crop that year.
In 1912 there were imported 175,835 bales, the United States

taking 12 per cent of the Egyptian crop.

In 1913 there were imported 191,075 bales. In 1914 there were imported 137,355 bales. In 1915 there were imported

261,220 bales. In 1916 there were imported 339,854 bales.

Then in 1917, owing to the activity of the submarines and the necessity of using lands to raise wheat to feed the soldiers, the production fell off. It was reduced in 1917 to 198,805 bales. In 1918 it was 114,580 bales. In 1919 it was 100,006 bales.

Then, Mr. President, we find that in 1920 there were imported into the United States 485,003 bales of this long-staple Egyptian cotton, grown by these Egyptian laborers, who, as I said before, receive about 30 shillings a month. I will read the whole statement:

Wages to cotton laborers (in Egypt) in 1912 averaged 30 shillings per month, according to Arno Schmidt. Assuming an increase of 100 per cent, the present average wage would be 60 shillings, which at current exchange (the pound sterling—\$3.92 at New York on April 15, 1921) would amount to \$11.76 per month, or 39 cents per day.

I respectfully submit that Americans, whose ideas of living are so immensely superior to the ideas of the Egyptian laborer, can not work in competition with that Egyptian laborer who receives 39 cents a day.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield. Mr. STANLEY. Is it not true that this long-staple cotion is raised in the main upon irrigated lands?

Mr. ASHURST. That is true; I might say wholly. The Pima cotton, which term is used interchangeably with Arizona Egyptian cotton, is raised wholly on irrigated lands.

Mr. STANLEY. Prior to the recovery by reclamation of these

lands by the Government, all of this long-staple cotton was imported, was it not?

Mr. ASHURST. Except such long staple as was grown in what we call the sea-island country, those islands off the coast of Florida and South Carolina.

Mr. STANLEY. There was no considerable amount of this long-staple cotton grown in continental United States?

Mr. ASHURST. It is my opinion that while some long staple was grown, there was no, as we call it, Egyptian Sakellaridis cotton grown in the United States, and there is none now grown in the United States except in Arizona and California.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the Senator believe it is a sound business policy in a government or a corporation to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in order to enable people hitherto en-gaged in a profitable business to engage in an unprofitable business?

Mr. ASHURST. I do not see the force of the Senator's ques-

Mr. STANLEY. I will try to make myself clear. Mr. ASHURST. It is my fault that I did not perceive the Senator's meaning.

Mr. STANLEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. These people who are engaged in growing long-staple cotton, under the stimulus of a bonus from the Government, were formerly engaged, if they were in the South, in raising short-staple cotton or corn or cattle, or anything else, in an unprotected and at the same time prosperous business. Is it wise that the Government should erect great dams, like the Roosevelt Dam, should spend untold millions of the people's money in reclaiming lands, not that people may make money on them but that they may lose money on them; not that they may engage in a profitable busi-ness but that they may be induced, and further buttressed and protected, into engaging in an unprofitable business? If this was a business that was of long standing, and some foreign competitor were underselling us, there might be some reason for it. But is there any more reason for the Government building dams in order that men may raise cotton at a loss than for the Government to make hothouses in order that they may raise grapes or bananas at a less in Montana or Nebraska or Alaska?

Mr. ASHURST. The United States has already invested in

Arizona \$20,000,000 in irrigation projects. That sum of money is not a gift; it is not a gratuity out of the Federal Treasury. The farmers and water users under the irrigation projects are required to repay that \$20,000,000 to the Government within

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will excuse me, I understand that, and I am not maintaining now that the Government will not ultimately recover some part of the money it has spent.

Mr. ASHURST. The Government will recover all of it. Mr. STANLEY. It does not make any difference, for the purposes of my question. I wish to ask the Senator if he regards it as good business in an individual or a corporation or a Government to deliberately expend, in the way of advancement or permanent investment or gratuity, millions of money for the encouragement of a business which will be unprofitable the minute men enter into it?

Mr. ASHURST. As I was proceeding to say, the Senator will bear in mind that twenty millions of dollars have been invested in Arizona in reclamation projects. An intensive campaign throughout the United States, not only in respect to cotton but all other agricultural projects, has been carried on for 10 years. No speaker, no singer, and few clergymen believe they have done their duty until they shall have admonished people to "Get back to the land"; and, indeed, Mr. President, if we are to subsist the American people, and if those who dwell in the cities, and now constitute 52 per cent of our people, are to subsist, we "must get back to the land." But you can not get a man back to the land by singing him a song or telling him how refreshing it is to arise with the sun. You can get a man "back to the land" only by making it profitable to him to get back to the land. As a business proposition, vain, how idle, how childlike, to appropriate \$20,000,000 to build up irrigation projects in Arizona, in California, and elsewhere, to encourage farmers, to send out literature to farmers urging them to plant long-staple cotton and other agricultural products, and then after they have planted their crops say that we will open wide the gate and allow the laborer in Egypt, who gets 40 cents a day, to come into competition with and destroy our farmer by taking away his market.

The Senator is entirely right. It is absurd to appropriate money and make speeches and sing songs and deliver lectures by the thousand urging people to go back to the soil, and as soon as they reach the land we say our solicitude is for the Egyptian laborer, not for the Arizona cotton grower. I think

the Senator is entirely right.

Mr. STANLEY. It is well for the Government to send people back to the land if their activities upon the land will add to the wealth of their countrymen, if they make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, if they raise two bushels of grain where one grew before. The purpose of having them go back to the land is to add by the most direct and most immediate method of creating essential wealth to the prosperity of the community. But if we have to pension the man on the the community. But if we have to pension the man on the land, his being back on the land does not help the community He is simply living in the shade of the country trees breathing in the salubrious air of the country climate. Having the moral influence of the rural precincts does not help the rest of us if we have to pay him to live there. He had better raise posies and daisies and tulips or he had better raise Cain or hunt and fish and do nothing than to tax the American public \$5 or \$10 for every dollar's worth of stuff that he produces. Our country produces a modicum of sea island cotton, 1 pound perhaps in 5, and that costs us five times as much

Mr. ASHURST. We are producing more of the long-staple

cotton.

Mr. STANLEY. But our importations exceed that production

immensely now.

Mr. ASHURST. The production of long-staple sea island cotton, of the kind grown in Arizona, dwindled last year to about 1,700 bales.

Mr. STANLEY. How much did we import? We imported over 400,000 bales. Mr. ASHURST.

Mr. STANLEY. Exactly; and we imported ten times as much as we raised, did we not?

Mr. ASHURST. No. We raised 250,000 bales in the Southwest.

Mr. STANLEY. And imported how much?

Mr. ASHURST. We imported last year 485,000 bales. Mr. STANLEY. That is twice as much. If you put a duty of 7 cents a pound on the cotton he produces, you impose a duty of 15 cents on every pound of cotton produced. You charge every consumer in the United States, 100,000,000 people, for an essential in order to create a new industry in which a few thousand people are engaged; and you know from the start, from the time you build your dam and before they go there, that they are going to lose money unless they live, not upon their labor but upon mine, not upon wealth created but from wealth appropriated, not on account of the natural advantages of the country but on account of the partial operation of the law.

Mr. ASHURST. Whenever the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who served with distinction in the House and who serves with distinction here, arises I tremble. I do not always tremble when other Senators rise, but I know that his reflections are usualy correct, and his choice rhetoric is hard to answer, but on this particular subject it so happens that he has a wealth of misinformation. This long-staple cotton goes into tires for automobiles, where great tensile strength is required.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator too much, but is not this sea-island cotton used in the

manufacture of mercerized cloth?

Mr. ASHURST. It is used in the making of high-grade Democrats voted and spoke, most of them, for a luxury tax. This cotton goes into very high-grade shirting-into shirts

that cost from \$6 to \$8 apiece.

But let us see about the philosophy of the situation. Have you been in universities and colleges so long that you are filled with free-trade theories? If you are a free trader, and have never done a day's work with your hands in your life, you can make a good argument for free trade, provided you say, "I believe in free trade on everything," but how a Democrat can stand for free trade on some things and tax other things I do not perceive.

I warn Democrats now, do not permit the American people to suspect that you look with favor on free trade. We lost the election of 1880 and we lost the election of 1888 because there was a suspicion in the public mind that we looked with favor on free trade. I have seen Democratic Senators in the North and in the West go down to defeat in their candidacies for Congress because they were suspected of being free traders. Every intelligent man knows that free trade exists only in the imagination of theorists. I was about to say there is no freetrade nation, but there is one, the Eskimos.

Sir, you are for a protective tariff? Very well, you can at least make an argument for a protective tariff if you say, "I am for a tariff on manufactured goods, and I am for a tariff on the raw materials," but how can you in honesty stand up and say "I am for a tariff on manufactured articles, but I am

opposed to a tariff on the raw materials"

We have reached the day, Mr. President, when the farmer who must subsist the people and the stock grower and the cotton grower who must clothe the people are going to say, "If you want free trade, very well; if you want a protective tariff, very well; but you shall not longer put the manufactured article, the product of the factory, under a high protective tariff and allow the products of the ranch and the field and the farm to be kept on the free list." If this be a farmers' bill, if this be a bill to protect the agricultural interests of our country, then let us protect the agricultural interests of our country.

I have already asked unanimous consent to include in the RECORD certain tables that have been prepared, some by myself and some by the Department of Agriculture, giving the importations of Egyptian cotton into the United States and the growth within recent years. I shall ask that my amendment lie upon the table until the time for voting comes, and then I shall ask a roll call on the amendment in the belief and in the earnest hope that it will be adopted, because if it is not adopted the bill will be of no utility and will be of no service to the cotton growers of the Southwest.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator's amendment proposes to increase the rate, as I understand it, as well as to

decrease the length of staple.

Mr. ASHURST. Oh, no; merely to increase the rate from 7 to 20 cents a pound.

Mr. HARRISON. Does it propose also to decrease the length of the staple?

Mr. ASHURST. I have not introduced such an amendment, but I believe some other Senator from a Southern State has introduced such an amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not know. I wanted to know what the Senator's amendment was and whether he desired the

staple to be decreased from 12 inches in length.

Mr. ASHURST. Of course, my amendment proposes to strike out 7 cents and insert 20 cents, but I have no objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi. I would not claim something for my own constituents that I would be unwilling to grant to other people.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask if all the cotton grown in Arizona is 13 inches in length?

Mr. ASHURST. We have some of what we call upland cotton that is of about the black but the first length. ton that is of about that length, but the great bulk of our cotton is from 1½ to 15.

Mr. HARRISON. In that connection I wish to call the atten-

tion of the Senator to the report of the House Ways and Means

Committee, upon which this legislation was based, in which report, prepared by Mr. Young, who introduced the measure in the House, it was said:

The Young emergency tariff bill proposes a duty of 7 cents a pound on cotton the staple of which 1½ inches in length. We are of the opinion that the minimum length of staple on which a tariff is to be levied should be 1½ inches and that the duty should be increased from 7 cents to not less than 10 cents a pound.

So there is a report and argument for a protective tariff on cotton of 13-inch staple, stating that as between 13 and 13 inches as applied to cotton from other countries the shorter staple should be adopted, and yet when they write their bill they only propose to make it 1% inches.

Mr. ASHURST. I may say for the Senator's information that my amendment which decreased the length of staple from $1\frac{\pi}{3}$ to $1\frac{\pi}{3}$ inches, as shown in the bill introduced in the last session of Congress, passed the Senate but was rejected in conference.
Mr. HARRISON. Of course, the bill throughout is based on

just the same deceptive and misleading and incorrect statements

as are found touching cotton in this report.

Mr. ASHURST. It seemed to me a species of hypocrisy so continuously to urge the farmer to work and then give him no sensible, practical method to get a profit out of his work. We hear so much about the ultimate consumer. I am thinking of the producer. If ever a time existed in the history of our country when we should think of the producer that time is here now, and that is the reason why I wish this rate increased from 7 to 20 cents a pound.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point certain statistics on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission

is granted.

The matter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Office of the Secretary, Washington, April 20, 1921.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with your request of April 15, I take pleasure in quoting below the imports of unmanufactured cotton into the United States from Egypt during the calendar year 1920 and the months of January to March, 1921, inclusive: Ca

lendar year: 1920	179,	Pour 894,	
January February March	3,	455, 881, 508,	283
	0,	000,	OOT

The reports furnished to this department covering imports of unmanufactured cotton do not indicate the number of bales, but show figures for pounds instead.

Yours, faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER, Secretary of Commerce.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1921.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I am sending you herewith a copy of a report on cotton production in the irrigated Southwest in 1920, together with some data prepared by Mr. Kearney for Mr. Heard's use.

Very truly, yours,

C. S. Scoffeld, Agriculturist in Charge Western Irrigation Agriculture, Production of American Egyptian cotton (500-pound bales). [Compiled Apr. 20, 1921.]

1912	375
1913	2, 135
1914	6, 187
1915	1, 095
1916	3, 331
1917	15, 966
1918	40, 343
1919	42, 374
1920 1	91, 965
1020	91. 900

¹ Census Bureau ginning report of Mar. 21, 1921. Imports of Egyptian cotton into United States (equivalent of 500-pound bales).

Period Aug. 1 to July 31.	Bales imported.	Per cent of total Egyptian crop.
1910-11 1911-12 1912-13 1913-14 1914-15 1914-15 1915-16 1916-17 1917-18 1918-19 1919-20	183, 786 175, 835 191, 075 137, 355 261, 220 339, 854 198, 805 114, 580 100, 006 485, 003	12. 4 12. 0 12. 9 9. 1 20. 5 35. 3 19. 9 9. 2 10. 5 43. 7

Cotton acreage of Egypt and percentage of total in Sakellaridis variety. [Compiled Apr. 21, 1921.]

Calendar year.	Total acres.	Percentage Sakel.
1912	1,788,000 1,789,000 1,820,000 1,231,000 1,718,000 1,742,000 1,364,000 1,634,000 1,897,000	16. 2 21, 9 32, 2 58. 0 62, 4 67. 6 72, 4 72, 9 69, 5

Sea-island cotton production in United States (from Bureau of Census ginning reports).

	Bales.
1915	111, 716
1916	117, 559
1917	92, 619
1918	52, 208
1919	6, 916
1920	11,725

Ginned prior to Mar. 21, 1921.

COTTON PRODUCTION IN EGYPT.

Mr. ASHURST. John A. Todd, "The World's Cotton Crops" (1915), states that the average size of landholdings in Egypt in 1913 was about 31 acres and the average land value per acre in 1913 was £50 to £200. There has been a considerable increase in land values and rentals since that time.

The average yield of fiber, according to the monthly agricultural statistics of the ministry of finance of Egypt (Oct. 31, 1920), was 343 pounds per acre for the five years 1915–1919. The following table, compiled from Government reports of Egypt and the United States, has been compiled by the Bureau

of Crop Estimates:

	Number of persons engaged in agriculture.	Acres in cultivated land.	Average area cultivated for each farm worker.	
Egypt (1907–1912)	2,315,000	5,457,000	2. 4	
Umrted States (1910)	12,390,000	293,794,000	23. 7	

COST OF PICKING COTTON IN EGYPT.

According to John A. Todd in The World's Cotton Crops (1915), the prewar wages for picking in Egypt ranged from 5 pence to 1 shilling per day, the lower wage being paid to children, who could pick from 30 to 50 pounds per day each. Taking Todd's statement as a basis and assuming (1) that adults average 75 pounds daily and received a wage of 1 shilling, (2) that the wage has doubled since the war and is now 2 shillings, this at current exchange is equivalent to about 39 cents for 75 pounds, or about one-half cent per pound of seed cotton. Since the lint percentage in Egypt averages at least 30 per cent, as compared with an average of 25 per cent in Arizona, 1,666 pounds of seed cotton in Egypt will yield a 500pound bale. The cost of picking 1,666 pounds of seed cotton at one-half cent per pound is \$8.33. The picking cost per pound of lint in Egypt, therefore, works out to 1\(^2\) cents, while in Arizona the cost is 16 cents when the pickers receive 4 cents per pound of seed cotton (the 1920 wage) and 8 cents when the pickers receive 2 cents per pound of seed cotton (the prewar

EMERGENCY TARIFF BILL.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, when this measure was under consideration in the Sixty-sixth Congress I was one of four Senators upon this side of the Chamber who voted against it. I accompanied my vote with some restrained comment, in the course of which I attempted to characterize the proposals which the bill then contained and which it now contains. I thought and I think that the measure was and is unscientific, unjust, and sure to defeat the hopes of those who have advocated it.

But, Mr. President, the scanty drippings of the sanctuary which oozed from beneath the closed doors of the Committee on Finance led me to expect, and I had earnestly hoped, that the inequities of the measure, although not in themselves diminished, would at least be palliated to an extent which would permit me to vote for it, even though holding my nose while doing so. I had hoped that the antidumping provisions and the provisions for the employment of American valuations

would be such as to dilute the dose in its bitterness; but, upon examination of those provisions which I had thought might sugar coat the pill to my taste, I discovered that they are so nebulous as to provide no substantial reason for my accepting that which I can not square with my convictions and which I regard as subversive of every principle of a protective tariff as the Republican Party has taught me to look upon protection. They provide in the main, Mr. President, for an enlargement of ministerial authority in the Treasury Department at a moment when the country is seeking relief from all such provisions, being wearied to exhaustion with the discretionary and arbitrary power which the last administration seized and extended under the specious claim of war necessity.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. MOSES. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is delivering such an interesting address and there are so few Senators present that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MOSES. Oh, Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not press that suggestion.

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MOSES. I hope the Senator will withdraw the sugges-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hamp-shire has the floor, and can not be interrupted without his consent even for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MOSES. I did not yield for that purpose, Mr. President,

I wish to finish my remarks with continuity, Mr. HARRISON. Very well; I withdraw the suggestion. Mr. MOSES. I know the Senator from Mississippi is vastly interested in what I am saying. I hope he will stay even though others may be absent.

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to stay, and I had hoped that more Republicans would be here so that they could listen to the

advice the Senator is giving.

Mr. MOSES. They can read my remarks.

I have heretofore regarded the bill and have characterized it on the floor of the Senate, and elsewhere, as being a helter-skelter hodgepodge of items forced into it through the power of a voting combination, sectional in its character and wholly selfish in its purpose. In fact, Mr. President, the advocates of the measure in the two Houses of Congress and in the two Congresses in which the bill has been under consideration are themselves in radical disagreement as to its effects. I have ventured to scan none too closely the report submitted on this bill by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I have also refreshed my memory regarding the parallel statements made in the House of Representatives in the last session of Congress by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means

As a result of this examination, I find discrepancies applicable to substantially every item in the measure. The rates of duty remain unchanged from the last Congress, but the sums of estimated revenue are revealed to us in wide disparity. For instance, in item 1 of the bill now before us, and with identical rates of duty upon wheat, I find the chairman of the House committee estimating the revenue to be \$2,429,529, while the distinguished chairman of the committee in the Senate estimates it to be only \$35,000. Passing from the first to the eighteenth item of the bill—wool—I find the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee estimating the revenue under this measure to be \$9.900,000, while the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, under the identical rate, estimates it to be \$15,000,000. I find the revenue from washed wool to be estimated by the chairman of the House committee at \$28,500,000, while the more moderate chairman of the Committee on Finance has estimated it at only \$300,000. And so it goes throughout every item in the list of 28 which make up the measure. Sometimes the House chairman sets the more rosy estimate, sometimes it is the Senate chairman who is possessed of the vision. In no case, Mr. President, do they agree. In order, however, not to weary the Senate or to detain it from the passage of this measure, which the Senator from Pennsylvania says is prayed for night and morning, and with a clamor of petition which reaches the skies and penetrates to the Senate Chamber, even to the enlarged precincts of the floor which we now enjoy, I will not read the table which I hold in my hand, but I will ask permission that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bursum in the chair) Without objection, permission is granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

Comparison of revenues under the emergency tariff bills.

[Note: This table shows the wide discrepancies in the estimated revenues under the two emergency tariff bills, notwithstanding the rates of duty are identical in both bills.]

			Estimated months)	revenue (12 under—	
Para- raph of H. R. 2435.	Commodity.	Revenue collected, calendar year 1920.	Fordney bill as vetoed, H. R. 15275, Sixty-sixth Congress.	Young bill H. R. 2435, Sixty- seventh Congress.	
1	Wheat Wheat flour and semolina	\$9,700	\$2, 429, 529	\$35,000	
2 3	Wheat flour and semolina	700	657, 900	16,000	
4	Flaxseed	4, 923, 400	2, 200, 000	6,000,000	
5	Beans		137, 625 3, 091, 760	1, 200, 000	
6	Peanuts	803, 700	5, 047, 950	750,000	
7 8	Potatoes	5,900	1,560,000	250, 000 400, 000	
9	Onions	363, 700	787, 040	200,000	
Part of the	Cleaned	215, 400	2,900,660	400,000	
	Uncleaned	178,500	235, 575	437, 500	
	Flour, meal, and broken Paddy	2,800	5,038 70,672	15,000 3,000	
10	Lemons	1,400 542,000	1,391,250	1,000,000	
11	Oils:		2,000,000	-,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
IST I	Peanut	760,600	4,333,420	520,003	
	Coctonseed	**********	2,479,400	20,000 1,000,000	
	Soya bean		3,837,000	10,000,003	
The same	Olive	975, 900	860,000	1,550,000	
12	Cattle		860,000 5,851,500	900,000	
13 14	Sheep Meats, fresh and prepared		102, 484	130,000	
16	Cotton, long staple.	***************************************	3,466,792	1,490,000	
17	Manuactures of long staple			12,000,000	
	Wool (clothing and mohair):	(2)	(1)	210,030	
18	Unwashed		r 000 000	15 000 000	
1000	Washed	851,400	9,900,000	15,000,000 300,000	
	Scoured	100, 200	45,000,000	45,000	
19	Manufactures of wool of par 18	(7)	11, 250, 000	2, 100, 000	
20 21	Sugar and molasses	78,678,000 940,700	42,000,000	118, 755, 070	
22	ButterCheese	1,047,660	1,250,000	120,000 1,150,000	
23	Milk and cream fresh	2,021,000	85,000	90,000	
24	Milk, condensed, and sugar of			(100,000,000	
25	milk		410,000	101, 250	
20	Wrapper tobacco	12,857,600	4, 800, 000	14, 100, 000	
till and	Filler tobacco *	16, 895, 100	(1)	19,000,000	
26	Apples Cherries, raw, and in brine	46,400	(1)	90,000	
27	Cherries, raw, and in brine	(2)	(1)	1 000 000	
20	mes and the second	629, 300	465,000	1,000,000	
-	Total for 12-month period	120, 732, 000	182, 626, 586	211, 227, 820	

Not estimated.

No figures.

Although "filler tobacco" is provided for in both emergency tariff bills, there is, however, no change in rates of duty on same from existing law. Therefore this item should not figure in this table.

Mr. MOSES. I will content myself, Mr. President, with offering the only possible explanation for the discrepancies in this table which suggests itself. These figures in both instances both House and Senate chairmen-were undoubtedly furnished by the Democratic experts who assisted the Senator from Alabama when he drew the now existing tariff law, who assisted the Representative from North Carolina as he drew the revenue measures under the Democratic administration, and who have now been brought over bodily to serve Republican chairmen in the House and Senate and to assist them by providing statistics as misleading as those which they provided for Democratic predecessors in years gone by. I shudder to think, Mr. President, of the mass of unreliable statistics with which both Houses of Congress will presently be inundated from the same Democratic source if these men are continued in their positions as expert statistical advisers in chief to Republican framers of a supposedly Republican tariff measure.

I have dwelt upon these defects of the measure, Mr. President, not for the purpose of emphasizing the inherent weakness of the bill, but to emphasize my own party regularity which would have led me to vote for the measure despite these errors if they had been the only ones which it contains. From the beginning of the movement to enact this legislation for the supposed benefit of suffering agricultural interests it has been vigorously asserted that no amendments were to be considered, that its items were sacrosanct, and that no impious hand should be laid upon them. In pursuance of this policy, sir, in the last be laid upon them. In pursuance of this policy, say, Congress we saw an amendment for mildly compensatory duties in the wool item offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts only to be incontinently rejected. We heard the Massachusetts only to be incontinently rejected. We heard the plaintive voice of the Senator from Missouri crying out in vain for a duty on sunflower seeds. We heard the friends of magnesite, of tungsten, and of latch needles vainly imploring the obdurate Senator from North Dakota to permit a few loaves of his tariff manna to fall into their empty hands; but all in vain.

There was a duty on hides, but none permitted on shoes. There was a duty on wool, but none on woolens. There was a duty on cotton, but none on cottons. There was a duty on wrap-

pers, but none on cigars.

The committee in the Senate was deaf eared and stony hearted until the junior Senator from Pennsylvania appeared before the tribunal presided over by his colleague and procured from its members the insertion in the bill of Title V, which would continue for the life of the measure the existing embargo and licensing system as applied to dyestuffs. By this action, Mr. President, the Finance Committee has vitiated the principle upon which the bill is supposedly drawn, for by no stretch of imagination can it be adequately contended that suffering agriculture can be benefited by an embargo on dyestuffs.

Such a proposal has been intermittently before Congress for more than a year and a half, and during all of that time I have persistently and consistently opposed it. My opposition to it has not abated now, and because of its inclusion in this measure I am compelled once more to vote against the bill. This proposal, Mr. President, is not protectionism; it is monopoly. Still less is it Republicanism. I do not believe that it is Democracy either. It is class legislation of the most vicious and dangerous kind; and it comes over to us as a device of the last administration, designed as a war measure and seized upon by the rapacious who are only too eager to continue the system under which they have already made enormous profits, and as the result of which they have entered into agreements of world-wide scope to assure them gigantic and undisturbed profits in the future.

Mr. President, I am a protectionist-a protectionist in the nth degree, believing in protection almost for protection's sake. Through the operation of that doctrine, devised by Hamilton and handed down to his successors in political faith, the Republican Party from its birth has stood for the development of American industry behind the sheltering wall of a protective tariff. Our richest epochs of industrial development and national prosperity have been those during which wise protection sm has held sway. This country prospered and grew great, Mr. President, not under the embargo and licensing system but under a protective tariff; and I can not understand, s r, why the dyestuffs industry should now be considered or dealt with differently from the tin-plate industry or from any other of the great industries of America which have grown up under a protective tariff. If the manufacturers of dyestuffs would be content with the same treatment which has been given to other American enterprise and in tiative, I would join with them in placing protection at whatever point, no matter how high, the necessities of their business would demand. But, Mr. President, when they come here with a renewed and impudent demand that measures arising from the exigencies of war time should be continued for their benefit at a moment when we are ardently seeking peace and a return to normalcy, my convictions and my pol tical judgment alike forbid acquiescence. Mr. President, this proposal can not be considered as an administration measure. No word in advocacy of it can be found in any of the President's official utterances; and one looks in vain throughout his message for any suggestion that this proposal should be written into the tariff legislation which he recommends.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. MOSES. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator has just said that this is not, as he understands, an administration measure. May I inquire of the Senator whether, if President Harding had recommended it, he would have thought that the measure was entitled to any greater consideration or any fairer treatment, or would it come with any additional sanctity? Would there be any obligation upon the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators to abdicate their prerogatives, forget their oaths of office, and follow that recommendation simply because it was an administration measure?

The Senator will remember that for a number of years Senators upon the other side of the Chamber have denounced the former President of the United States, Mr. Wilson, and denounced the Democrats because, as they said, the Senate and House of Representatives had degenerated into rubber stamps; that all that the administration needed to do was to make a recommendation and it became a law. I had supposed that when the Republican Party came into control there would be a manifestation of independence that would command the admiration of some of those who had been so dictated to in the past.

Mr MOSES. I hope I am giving an exhibition of that kind

now, Mr. President.

Mr. KING. I commend the Senator, and I sincerely hope that his example will be followed by other Republican Senators.

Mr. MOSES. This bill contravenes the President's emphatic dictum that we shall have more than a score of the active industries of the country, and it puts hundreds of business men to the disadvantage of exposing the secrets of their business to some petty agent of the War Trade Board which continues to function, though war has long since ceased. I do not believe, sir, that any \$900 a year civil-service clerk in Washington is competent to run any business at arm's length, and I can see no adequate reason for thus singling out for conspicuous favoritism an industry already so profitable that it is easily able to maintain in Washington the largest, the most highly organized, the best paid, and the most arrogant of lobbies which this Capitol has ever seen.

It appears, Mr. President, that the impoverished dyestuffs companies of the country who, in December, 1919, were hammering at the gates of Congress with the plaintive cry that they could not live out the winter unless still further privileges were given to them, have, nevertheless, been able in the meantime to expend in the calendar year of 1920 the not inconsiderable sum of \$104,932.61 in pressing forward the measure now before us.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, would it bother the Senator if I should interrupt him further? I apologize for doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New

Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. MOSES. I yield. Mr. KING. The Senator has stated that under this measure manufacturers would be compelled to make known and reveal their trade secrets, their processes, and so forth, to some supernumerary, petty official. The Senator, perhaps, is advised of the fact that quite recently the War Trade Board—and its functions of course are to be continued and it is to be perpetuated, although assigned to the Treasury Department-has required that the applicant shall go-

Mr. MOSES. I will touch on that later, Mr. President—Mr. KING. To an organization which is controlled by the dye producers of the United States.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator only anticipates what I intended to say upon that subject.

Mr. KING. I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. MOSES. Of this amount, substantially three-quarters, or \$70,464.33, was paid for that which is euphemistically described in the Knit Goods Bulletin for April, 1921, a copy of which I have before me, as "legislative expenditures." The income of this body-and I am speaking, Mr. President, of the American Dyes Institute-during the same period was derived from dues, assessments, and special assessments in the tota, sum of \$131,976, and the items of expenditure are of such interest that I venture to ask that the article to which I refer may be included in my remarks at this time without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Knit Goods Bulletin, April, 1921.]

HIGH COST OF GETTING DYE LICENSE—OVER \$70,000 CHARGED TO LEGISLATIVE EXPENSES IN AMERICAN DYES INSTITUTE'S STATEMENT OF INCOME AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR ONE YEAR.

The high cost of lobbying for the establishing of a dye-licensing system is shown in the financial statement of the American Dyes Institute of March 9 to the members of the institute. The statement comprises Bulletin A-205, and shows income and expenditure from January 1, 1920, to December 30. The total disbursements were \$104.932.61, of which \$70,464.33 is charged to legislative expenditures. Salaries and counsel fees are put down at \$20,125.78. The cost of monthly meetings and luncheons was \$2,443.43. Under legislative expenditures of \$70,464.33 in one year, to secure the passage of the Longworth bill, there appears, among others, the following items:

Hotel bills...

Tips, meals, hotel, taxi, etc...

Evarts, Choate, Sherman & Leon, fee to Joseph H. Choate, jr., up to Oct. 10, 1920...

Judge J. Harry Covington...

Evarts, Choate, Sherman & Leon, Joseph H. Choate, jr., traveling expenses to Paris...

Payment on account Paris trip, Joseph H. Choate, jr...

Evarts, Choate, Sherman & Leon, Joseph H. Choate, jr... 25, 000, 00 25, 000, 00 505, 01 3, 494, 99 1, 020, 96 Evarts, Choate, Sherman & Leon Various expenses incident to distribution of A. D. I. pam-phlet Expense incident to distribution done by legislative com-872.93 mittee 497. 12
Article prepared and published 301. 29
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and printing 28. 91
Supplying, addressing, and mailing postals and envelopes in congressional dyestuff hearings 559.82
The income from dues, assessments, and special assessments was \$121.976. Among the accounts payable is shown an item of \$21.505.01—Evarts, Choate, Sherman & Leon—this, apparently, an expense in addition to the several large payments to this firm.

At the January meeting of the American Dyes Institute the treasurer submitted his report covering the year 1920. At the February meeting the treasurer submitted the auditor's indorsement of the report, which was sent to the members in detail. Above figures are from this report. mittee

Mr. MOSES. In this compilation, Mr. President, it is worth noting that the largest items of expenditures were those for counsel fees, which amounted to about \$50,000, divided in equal parts, one paid to Joseph H. Choate, jr., as his compensation to October 10, 1920, and the other to Judge J. Harry Covington, of this city, who descended from the Federal bench in order to take the more lucrative employment which this client affords. Another interesting item is one of \$1,505.01 paid to Mr. Choate for his traveling expenses to Paris, with a further payment "on account Paris tr'p" of \$3,494.99, while hotel bills for the wellhoused lobby of the dye makers amounted to \$7,670.28; and the further impoverishment of the dye makers is shown by the item "Tips, meals, hotels, taxis, etc.," amounting to \$876.66. It is further worthy of note that the financial report of the dye makers to their members contains the item of an amount payable to Mr. Choate of \$21,505.01. For these sums-in hand and payable-Mr. Choate has spent no inconsiderable portion of his time in roaming about the country addressing parlor meetings of ladies in advocacy of national defense to be obtained by giving his clients an absolute monopoly in the dyestuffs market of America. What crimes, Mr. President, are committed in the name of preparedness when a liberal fee is attached thereto!

I have sometimes wondered, Mr. President, whether the collateral motive for pressing this un-Republican, un-Democratic, un-American scheme was not a desire to maintain or to create jobs in the Federal service, whose personnel Congress and the country so earnestly desires to reduce. For instance, Mr. President, in a letter from the American Dyes Institute, under date of May 3 of the present year, addressed to me, and I suppose to every other Member of the Senate, occurs a paragraph calling attention to the fact that the passage of the socalled Knox peace resolution will automatically end the authority of the War Trade Board, the tenure of which this bill would continue. In connection with this, sir, it is interesting to note the manner in which the War Trade Board is now functioning with regard to dyestuff licenses. An American consumer of dyes recently received from the War Trade Board a copy of the new conditions which that board has set up for the obtaining of licenses and in which it is required that the applicant must apply first to the American Dyes Institute before applying to the War Trade Board. It is the American Dyes Institute, I venture to remind the Senate, which has so lavishly recompensed Mr. Choate and Judge Covington for their services and so liberally enable them to journey to Paris and to dispense largess to the bell boys of Washington.

The moving spirit in the American Dyes Institute is one Morris R. Poucher, formerly connected with the Badische Co.a firm well known in the chemical industry-and who is now associated with the Du Ponts, who in equal measure have become notorious and noted in the same line of bus ness. Mr. Poucher is chairman of the executive committee of the Dye Institute; he is on the advisory committee of the War Trade Board appointed by the Dye Institute; he is on the advisory committee of the Textile Alliance, who imported the German reparations dyestuffs; he is also, I understand, director of the Textile Alliance, where he represents the Dye Institute. In other words, he is the Dye Institute, he is the Du Pont Co., he is the Textile Alliance, and it is now proposed to make him the doorway to the War Trade Board. In these various capacities the way will be open to him to know not only the details of the business of every dye manufacturer in the United States, but to secure an accurate line on the consumer as well-to whom he may dictate what he may or may not use. If this, Mr. President, is to be the policy of the War Trade Board, whose continuance is provided in this measure, the dye consumers of the country might as well understand in the beginning that the entire dyestuffs business of the United States is to be turned over to Mr. Poucher and those whom he represents, and that they will determine who shall or shall not continue in business, whether manufacturing, importing, or consuming.

The provisions of Title V in the bill, Mr. President, are open to other avenues of criticism. It would appear from the language employed that an absolute embargo is intended upon all dyes, whether natural or artificial. The word "dyestuffs" which the bill contains is new in our statutes. It has never been found in any tariff bill before. It has received no legal interpretation. It has been used indiscriminately in trade papers and in discussion, so that it is impossible to tell from the language of the bill as it stands whether this word shall include only the coal-tar colors or whether it also embraces natural dyes, such as logwood, fustic, natural indigo, natural alizarin, ultramarine, Prussian blue, and the like, to the end that its operation shall bring into its all-embracing tribute not only the textile manufacturer, the color maker, the paint fac-

tory, the lithographer, the ink maker, and the tanner, but even the humble washerwoman at her tub, who must blue the clothes before drying them.

It should also be noted, Mr. President, that the bill in this title provides no means for a further issuance of licenses, and it is by implication only that the consumer may enjoy even the limited privilege which he has thus far possessed. The personnel and the records of the War Trade Board-with such remnants of appropriation as the board still enjoys-are, it is true, transferred from the State Department to the Treasury; and there, Mr. President, will be found nebulous authority granted to the Secretary to "make rules and regulations necessary for the enforcement of this act." The Secretary thus becomes the magisterial officer who must define quality, quantity, price, and delivery. And it is pertinent to ask through whom he will exercise these functions. Is the remaining appropriation for the War Trade Board sufficient for the purpose, or shall we soon be confronted with a deficiency appropriation to provide for a new army of clerks, statisticians, and experts to be added to the army of tax eaters which the war created and which we seem unable to demobilize? In a statement issued the other day by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania he declared that the American people are more concerned in getting taxes reduced and "retiring the sheriff to the background" than in any academic discussion of international disarmament." May I add to this sage remark the further comment that the American people are still more concerned in freeing the business of the country from the palsying hand of governmental regulation than they are in setting up any monopolies?

Mr. President, I am well aware that this bill will pass. Its advocates are already celebrating their victory. In the edition of the American Dyestuff Reporter for May 2, 1921, on its first page, will be found an article announcing in large type that "The fight has been won!" In the course of this article a deserved tribute is paid to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania for the response, "both prompt and gratifying," which he made to the appeal of the dye makers; and the editor adds that he "does not imagine that Messrs. King, Moses, and others of the opposition will find much to encourage them." He concludes his panegyric with the injunction that "Philadelphia, New Hampshire, and Colorado papers please copy." On another page of the same journal is to be found an order issued in rhyme, as follows:

Lordly solons, Nation's stay, Legislative mill, Congress, Senate, Warren—Hey! Pass that dyestuff bill!

I assume, Mr. President, that the Congress, the Senate, and the President, who is thus affectionately and commanding y addressed by his Christian name, will be interested in the gloating already going on at Wilmington and so soon to be amply justified by the action of the Senate on Wednesday.

Mr. President, I am a Republican-orthodox and regular. prefer infinitely to vote with my party, or with the majority of my party associates here, rather than to vote against it or them. Insurgency for insurgency's sake has no charm for me: and it is only because this measure runs counter to all the doctrines of sound Republicanism that I am voting against it. If it stood alone, if it bore no relation to more important tariff proposals which soon will come before us, it is probable that I would have contented myself with no word of protest save in my negative vote. Put, Mr. President, we shall soon have before us a general tariff bill. Within six weeks it may be, certainly long before this measure shall have run its limited span of life, the tariff bill of 1921 will have reached the Senate. I am convinced, sir, that the same arguments now advanced, the same forces now arrayed to secure the passage of these proposals as an emergency measure, will then be equally vigorous in demanding that they be continued as permanent legislation. They can, and no doubt will, argue cogently that nothing has happened in the intervening time to change the situation from to-day. They will ask why if they are to-day entitled to that which this bill gives them they will not be equally entitled to it six weeks hence. To that demand no adequate answer can be made. the passage of this bill, Mr. President, we are opening the door for the continuance of a policy which no man here n his heart believes will furnish an effective remedy for any of the distress which any interest now suffers and for which no man here can find an adequate excuse. But we shall have it fastened upon us.

The cry from the country during the whole period while this iniquitous license and embargo proposal has been before the Congress has been for a reduction in the high cost of living; and yet, sir, it is worthy of note that substantially every measure which Congress has been called upon to cons der in that time has looked toward the maintenance, or the increase, of the high

prices which war fever brought upon us. The country has gone on with its cry for high and still higher wages, and prices and profits. Deluded interests still think to lift themselves by their boot straps through congressional action. What the country needs, str, is not legislation, but liquidation. Until every interest of investment, or manufacture, or production, and of labor is willing to confront the inevitable reactions of the war, is willing to write off its losses, is willing to begin anew under the conditions which the reactions of war involve, this country can have no economic peace or progress.

A homely rhymster, whose verse is a daily delight to thousands of readers, has pictured the situation; and I ask the Senate and the country to take counsel from these words of

Walt Mason:

EXIL TIMES.

There is a crisis everywhere, and all the world is in despair. I read the news from day to day, from countries near and far away, and I'm discouraged as I mark our prospects, desolate and dark. Oh, anarehy and doom and wreck and countless evils are on deck; some crisis every day appears and humps its back and wags its ears, and statesmen cry, as they've long cried, "The tail must travel with the hide." For six long years it's been the same; the crisis played its low-down game, and filled us with the dumps and blues and kept us shaking in our shoes. We had a crisis months ago, because no prices then were low, and profiteers were on our trail, demanding all our hard-earned kale. That crisis slumped, another rose, and now low prices are our foes, because the cost no longer soars a thousand mills have closed their doors, and workless workmen walk the streets and clamor vainity for the eats and soak the silken shirt they wore when tother crisis had the floor. I'm tired of all this crisis stuff; they've fed me up—I've had enough.

Mr. President, history has a trick of repeating itself. Twelve years ago a Republican President had just entered the White House, and he, too, came from the State of Ohio. Behind him stood the largest vote that any President had up to that time ever received. The Republican majority in both Houses of Congress was ample; and that majority wrote a tariff bill. That tariff bill was a Pandora's box of political evil for Republicanism. The year following its enactment saw the Republican majority in the House of Representatives swept away, saw State after State, previously deemed safely Republican, taken into the Democratic column, and saw the Republican majority in this Chamber sadly diminished. Two years later came the frightful debacle in the Republican Party and in its train came eight years of Wilsonism and war, bringing with it the embargo and licensing system which this bill would continue. I hope, Mr. President, that the Republican Party of 1921 is not again setting its feet in the path of 1909.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I have listened with great attention, some amusement, and some astonishment to the combination of logic, eloquence, doggerel, and prejudice which have been emitted by my distinguished friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses]. It is not my purpose to approach the consideration of the amendment to this bill for which I am responsible from the standpoint of a profit and loss account of a Dolly Varden calico mill in New England, but from the standpoint of the roster of the dead who have died in this Great War, from the standpoint of the list of casualties, and I make my appeal to the men who have followed the history of this war and learned the lessons it has taught. It will require but a few moments, Mr. President, to justify this amendment, explain its purpose, and satisfy thoughtful men of its wisdom.

When the Great War with Germany broke out 99 per cent, perhaps, of all the projectiles that were flung against the allied forces were filled with high explosives, high explosives which France and Great Britain could not and did not produce, but which eventually were produced by the United States. In the last great retreat an examination of the huge ammunition dumps of the German Army showed that over 50 per cent of their projectiles, instead of being charged with high explosives which merely exploded the projectile and scattered its fragments, were filled with poisonous gases which mingled in the air and asphyxiated and destroyed thousands, even though not within their immediate range.

What does that lesson teach? It teaches that from practically a negligible quantity of projectiles charged with poisonous gases during the war there developed fully 50 per cent so charged, and if the war had continued two years longer and America had not made the progress which enabled us to meet these people upon common ground the story of the war would have been different.

Let me read to you, Senators, a few observations made by a man whom I have the honor to call my friend, Col, Phillippe Bunau-Varilla, who left one of his legs upon a field in Flanders, in speaking of the blindness of the French people in not meeting the Germans upon the common ground of the development of organic chemistry and therefore the production of chemical armament. He said:

This seems incredible, but it is a fact!

The blindness of the French administration, the deceiving songs of the pacifists as to the impossibility of a European war, had gradually led France to get engulfed in the methodic and devilish entanglement of the German dyestuff industry.

The terrible situation in which France, as well as Great Britain and Russia, was placed by the lack of ammunitions after the earlier battles of the war is explained thus:

Who makes dyes to-day can to-morrow make high explosives—with the same men, with the same plant, with the same materials—provided he disposes also of oxidized nitrogen.

The dye industry and the high-explosive industry are so intimately connected as to be virtually one. In fact, melinite and trinitrotoluene are nothing but hydrocarbides, extracted from distilled coal tar, in which is incorporated oxidized nitrogen.

which is incorporated oxidized nitrogen.

Germany had established all over the world the monopoly of her apparently innocent dye industry. It was the scientific noose which was going to strangle all her enemies after the first months of war owing to the famine of explosives.

The vie methods of warfare admirably condensed by the celebrated Count Luxburg, the minister of Germany to Argentina—suggesting neutral ships should be sunk "without leaving traces"—were also followed in peace. The same men who enjoyed the hospitality of the United States, while depositing bombs with time fuses in the ships leaving the American wharves, were active during peace times also.

The dye industry being for everybody, except Germany, a peaceful one, and, for Germany only, a war industry, it was protected against competition by German war methods.

Whenever a non-German dye appeared either in France, Great

Whenever a non-German dye appeared either in France, Great Britain, or America, immediately it was stifled under an avalanche of German goods. If, however, the competitor resisted the business pressure he was soon put out of commission by the purely Boche

pressure he was soon put out of commission by the purely Boche trickery.

Suitable additions of noxious substances were made by criminal hands in the mills of the users of non-German dyes. Everybody was soon convinced that non-German dyes did not possess the standard qualities necessary for their industrial use. By this double method in time of peace—dumping and sabotage—the Boche acquired the practical monopoly of the dye industry. Free-trade nations were glad of it. The innocent economists and the candid pacifists were conveniently misled, while in fact the monoply of the dye industry constituted the control of explosives by Prussia. She alone was capable of making the explosives on a large scale, when she should decide to let loose her dogs of war and to complete the task which she had begun in 1619. This monopoly was to insure her conquest of the world.

Everybody remembers the universal complaints about the absence of dyes when the war was declared by Germany. Nobody, of course, remembers any complaint about the absence of explosives. It was, however, the very same question. The manufacture of explosives. It was, however, the very same question. The manufacture of dyes was the manufacture of explosives. The various nations abstained, naturally, from exposing their incredible blindness and the almost criminal neglect of their Governments in not having taken, during peace, adequate protective measures. Their stock of material for providing their artillery with high-explosive shells was practically just sufficient for the first weeks of the war.

Germany alone was capable of the industrial effort necessary to furnish the large masses of explosives required for the war. She had of the plant, she had of the personnel, she had of the raw material. She had also succeeded in freeing herself from the necessity of importing nitrates from Chile. Chile, on the contrary, was the only source open to Germany's blind enemies for obtaining the oxidized nitrogen which is the essential element of high explosives or of gunpow

Thanks to supreme technical efforts she had succeeded in devising the proper scientific and industrial methods to extract from the atmosphere the oxidized nitrogen necessary for the manufacture of her explosives. It is safe to say Germany alone among the nations at war could produce an unlimited quantity of explosives on her own soil and with products generated within her own frontiers.

Mr. President, to-day perhaps the noblest call to man is the dissipation of the possibility of future war, and perhaps one of the strongest arguments that can be put up to Governments is that to avoid war we must disarm. But what profits it, Mr. President, if we shall destroy our battleships, if we shall destroy our arsenals, if we shall cease to cast guns and swords and bayonets, if we leave the world's productive capacity of organic chemistry in the hands of Germany, which enables her to turn out instantly, with the flexibility of her plants, the most deadly weapon that human ingenuity has yet devised? You may sink every German battleship to the most remote cave of the sea, you may reduce to dust her proudest fortresses, you may blow the great Krupp plant to hades, and you may cast the big Berthas into plowshares and pruning hooks, but if you leave the dye industry in the possession of Germany she has the world by the throat.

Mr. President, those of us who take an interest in what has happened during this war, those of us who seek intelligently to understand the causes of the great destruction of this late war, those of us who have visited the hospitals and seen the asphyxiated boys, many of them demented-my God, how can we refuse by our votes to take over to ourselves the ability to do that which they would do? Nations do to each other, what the others would do to them, but if we are wise we should be sure to get ready to do it first.

I place no importance at all in this discussion upon the eco-nomic features of this amendment, and yet perhaps there could be no greater argument made for any American industry than could be made for the protection of the dye industry, when you take into consideration the circumstances under which it came into being,

Woodrow Wilson had the vision to see what it meant. Twice has he specifically, in his messages to Congress, called attention to the necessity of the building up of this great arm of national defense. In 1914, when the war broke out, there were seven manufacturers of dyes in the United States. In 1920 there were 184, and yet we hear gentlemen cry "monopoly"; that this industry is in the hands of a few. We hear gentlemen complain of the efforts these people are making to protect the two or three hundred million dollar investment. Mr. President, every time a superbattleship is built in the United States it is paid for to the extent of forty or fifty million dollars out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. Every time à dye plant is constructed which costs forty or fifty million dollars it is built at the expense of private individuals, who, because of the peace-time uses of their product, can afford to construct these plants, which, as I have said, are almost instantaneously convertible into munition plants. Yet your battleship in five or six years is obsolete and your investment is gone; but your dye plant, if the country is progressive, will become greater and greater and more efficient, not only for the purposes of peace but for the purposes of war.

We hear complaints that these institutions are great, enormously capitalized, and make large profits. Mr. President, in this day of grace, when great things are being done in the world, it requires great instrumentalities to accomplish them. You can not equip an army to fight 5,000,000 Huns in the blacksmith shops at the crossroads, and you can not finance it at the little national banks in the villages throughout the country. have to take a view of this situation, Mr. President, that is becoming the size of our country, the dignity of our statesmanship, and the wisdom and patriotism of the men who sit here

and represent the American people.

I ask leave to print as an appendix to my remarks an article in the New York Herald, written by Mr. Edwin C. Hill, on the uses of gas in warfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and

leave is granted.

APPENDIX.

WORLD MASTERY LIES IN "DEW OF DEATH"—POISON GAS FROM AIR-PLANES WILL DECIDE NEXT BIG WAR—GEN. FRIES, CHIEF OF THE CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE, DEPICTS HORRORS AS A REAL DANGER FACED BY OUR ISLAND POSSESSIONS AND EVEN BY NEW YORK—AMAZ-ING REVELATIONS IN OFFICIAL MEMORANDA.

**Horrors of the Great War reached their climax with the use of poison gas projected far behind the front lines by means of gas-filled shells. Yet terrible though the results were both for the fighting forces and civil population, they pale into insignificance beside the picture of the gas war of the future painted in the accompanying article.

"The facts about armament plans of the several nations gathered by the New York Herald and presented in these columns from time to time have attracted nation-wide attention. The details presented to-day—all from official sources—are sure to gain international attention. No such frank revelation of the possible use of poison gas dropped broadcast by fleets of airplanes ever has been published, and the description of the probable results staggers the imagination. Literally, as the writer says, 'The mastery of the world rests in the dew of death.'

"[By Edwin C. Hill.]

"[Copyright, 1921, by the New York Herald.]

"[Copyright, 1921, by the New York Herald.]

"New York Herald Bureau, "Washington, D. C., May 7.

"Hurricanes of steel smashed German power on land and The dew of death will paralyze and destroy the lunging battalions of a future assault against civilization.

"The last war ended with diapason closing full, great guns roaring from the North Sea to the Alps, the ears of the warriors dinned by infernal tumult. The next war will close in the silence of death, broken only by the moaning and the screams

of the blinded and the burned.
"Wars of the past have been conflicts of artillerymen and engineers, clumsy duels with clumsy tools not very different from the tools used by Napoleon, Grant, and Von Moltke. the future will be unimaginably dreadful struggles, directed by middle-aged and elderly persons in spectacles sitting in labora-tories and loosing upon fields of battle, battle fleets, and great helpless cities miasmas of death that not only destroy the body but wreck the mind through fear, sheer terror of the mysterious. the unknown.

"Compounds of volatile, lethal poisons, poisons that will fall as dew from the clouds, literally a dew of death; poisons that will be drifted across great spaces like fever murk from a swamp; poisons that will be discharged in shells from pneumatic guns, furtively, silently, will contend for the mastery of the world. These will be chemists' wars, if wars must come again, and the simple truth is that the mind of man is not yet able to picture the horrors that will be released.

"DREADFUL FORECAST OF EVILS BY NEW WAR DESTROYERS.

"Great cities, an ocean apart from their country's enemy and tranquil in fancied security, far out of reach of the longest range gun, will stir from sleep in the night to the agony of their people, as from unseen poison ships, circling above them in the dark, dews of death fall to blind and burn and paralyze, Fortresses, manned by the most powerful ordnance man has been able to perfect, will lie helpless under this gentle, frightful rain. Armies with banners will be leveled to the dust, no longer armies, but masses of sightless, pain-crazed human beings, incapable of motion, incapable of thought.

In all the thousands of years that men have schemed to slay other men for greed, ambition, or the love of women nothing even remotely so terrible has come into warfare as the discovery and coldly scientific application of poison gases as a weapon. The possibilities are absolutely illimitable. There are 200,000 chemicals known to man, and as yet only 5 per cent of this vast number have been used for experimentation. Yet with the few discoveries made in the 5 per cent and employed in the Great

War the casualties were terrific.

"The Surgeon General of the United States Army reports that almost one man out of every three that entered the hospitals of the American Expeditionary Forces as a battle casualty was suffering from enemy gas. Including the marines and attached naval personnel, poison gas caused 72,056 casualties, of which 1,271 proved fatal. That is what the dew of death did to American fighting men. What it did to the French and the British can be imagined without statistics.

"Yet from 1915, when the Germans first drifted a poison cloud across the field of Ypres, until they surrendered, more than three years later, they developed only 3 per cent efficiency. Had it been 50 per cent so early in the struggle, or even later, history

might have had another tale to tell.

"'Had they got up to 50 per cent,' said Brig. Gen. Amos A. Fries, Chief of Chemical Warfare Service, United States Army, we would have had to come home-those of us left.'

"IN ITS INFANCY DURING LATE WAR-NOW A MENACE.

"At Ypres in 1915, when the Kaiser's hosts added the new terror to warfare, they had the world in their hands had they followed up the shocking surprise their poison waves sent through the British and the Canadians-but they did not follow it up. One is reminded of Victor Hugo's explanation of French defeat at Waterloo—the sunken road of Ohain, Napoleon's strange indecision, Grouchy's blunder. Hugo put it in a word: God.

"Nor did the Germans advance their primary advantage with the energy that had marked them in all other fields of military achievement and purpose. The German chemical-shell program was 25 per cent of their artillery ammunition. During the entire time that the American troops were in action it is doubtful that the chemical-shell firing ever exceeded 15 per cent. They could not manufacture chemicals fast enough. In the battle of the Meuse-Argonne, the longest and hardest-fought battle the American troops participated in, the Germans used a relatively small amount of gas. Their available supply had been dissipated in other sectors and little was left to employ against the Americans. But with poor efficiency and a dwindling supply it must not be forgotten that German poison gas struck out of the battle line one in every three of the American fighting men who went to hospital.

"Does anyone think that the vision of whole cities thrown into helpless agony by invisible airships dripping poison is too fantastic? Or that it would be impossible to subdue such fortresses as Corregidor or the green-terraced ramparts that guard the Narrows of New York Bay? Nevertheless that is the cool and carefully weighed opinion of Gen. Fries and of his aids in the Chemical Warfare Service. They approach these amazing con-clusions with knowledge of secrets that are not accessible to the rest of us-grim and dreadful mysteries that have been worked out in the great Chemical Warfare Service laboratories at Edgewood, Md., and in the many private laboratories whose science is given to the United States Government.

"If the Philippines are ever attacked by an enemy, it will be a gas attack, Gen. Fries believes, and the measure of his opinion is indicated in the following interesting memorandum he sent a few days ago to Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, who is now on his way to our Far Eastern possessions. Here it is:

"FORECAST OF LOSS OF PHILIPPINES BY GAS RELEASED BY ENEMY.

"Japs can take Philippine Islands with gas—let us assume Japan has decided to make war upon the United States. Her first objective is the Philippine Islands. They lie to the south of Japan and more or less parallel to the Asiatic coast as is Japan herself farther north. American troops and fortifications are concentrated on the island of Corregidor at the mouth of Manila Bay. This is the usual tropical island, with an extreme length of 7 miles and an extreme width of 1

mile, the total area being less than 3 square miles. It is rather a typical promontory on the west, gradually shading off to almost sea level on the east. It has the usual tropical growth, with cleared places for barracks, officers' quarters, and gen emplacements.

"Japan, having decided on war, will seize a small bay within 100 miles of Corregidor. Her air force will fly there by way of Formosa and land in the little harbor picked out. She will carry in her fleet 100 tons of mustard gas. This gas and the methods of making it were thoroughly worked out by the different Allies in the World War. Hence Japan's knowledge of the gas and of manufacturing it are complete.

"A force of 50 planes, each carrying it ton of mustard gas in a simple tank, will leave at night for Corregidor. A half hour later they will be over the island and will be synthing it thoroughly with mustard gas from one end to the other. Fifty tons of mustard gas, even if half of it is wasted on the surrounding waters, will form a deadly concentration that can not be gotten rid of under 5 to 10 days. Men can not live anywhere on the island without wearing masks and oil clothing which is gas proof.

"Within 48 hours the place will be practically untenable for anybody. Animals and all human beings will begin to grow sick from injury to the lungs or from very bad burns. Forty-eight hours alone will suffice for a reduction of the island without firing a shot. Thus will pass the Philippine Islands into the hands of the Japanese.

"The next step will be just to hold the Philippine Islands and walt for results. They might possibly attempt to apply the same methods of attack against the Hawalian Islands. It is perfectly certain that the attack would be just as successful against the Hawalian Islands as against the Philippines, unless the Americans have a superior air force that can keep the invaders way.

"The Caroline and Marshall Islands, including the island of Yapover which the Japanese are to have a mandate, would afford numerous small harbors which w

"GEN. FRIES DESCRIBES POSSIBILITY AS A VERY REAL DANGER.

"In preparing this extraordinarily frank memorandum, Gen. Fries 'got right down to brass tacks,' as he says, believing that no good would be served by minimizing a very real danger. And the same danger would apply, in his opinion, to any part of the United States whatever in war time if the Navy was not big enough and the air force not numerous enough to keep an enemy from establishing a base for poison-gas raids.

"Take New York City itself-

"Said the general-

"Said the general—
"New York, the magnificent. For the sake of argument, let us assume that the United States Navy, allowed to deteriorate, had suffered defeat or that the Atlantic Fleet had been outmaneuvered by a cuming foe. Let us assume that the same neglect of military aviation continues. What then? The answer is as certain as that might follows day. Airplanes are being developed so that even now it would be possible for great squadrons to leap the Atlantic and sprinkle our cities with burning poison. If an enemy nation could seize and hold a base in the Caribbean, we would be wide open to the most frightful bombardment mind of man ever conceived—not a deluge of shot and shell but a rain of something infinitely more dreadful.

"We know that 10 tons of mustard gas will desolate a square mile and make life impossible in that square mile. Suppose a fleet of 100 poison sprinklers swooped over New York in the night, having defeated or evaded the American flying fleet. Death, desolation, and deteat would most certainly result. In the millions of the great city hundreds of thousands would be blinded, burned horribly, driven insane from terror. It is not a picture one cares to contemplate even in speculation, but I tell you that the scientific use of gas in warfare is approaching this extreme of horror.

"The American people should know that these possibilities exist, that the peril is not a nightmare of military men, but a cold, scientific fact, well enough proved in the past war and infinitely more potent now. We have adopted a policy of the utmost frankness because we believe in the sound judgment of the American people. We have our secrets, but we do not believe in trying to keep too many matters secret. Too much secrecy often defeats the very purpose of secrecy. We believe in being frank to ourselves, to our comrades in the Army and Navy, to Congress, and to the people as a whole. We helieve in publicity, because we don't see how the Army and Navy, or any of the other institutions of our Republic, can be prop

"BATTLE FIELDS OF THE FUTURE NEVER TO BE FREE FROM GAS

"Poisonous gases in the past war caused 27.3 per cent of all American casualties, killed and wounded. Considering only the wounded admitted to hospitals, over 31 per cent were gas alone, and yet the use of gas, even at the end of the World War, was a child's game compared to what it will be in the future. With gas defiting from clouds let loose on the battle line, with gas being thrown to enormous distances by all calibers of guns, and with gas raining from airplanes or bursting from airplane bombs, the battle fields of the future will never be free from gas.

"This is no exaggeration. We have the raw materials for these gases. We have the personnel to manufacture them. We have the factories. More than that, we have the men in the Army and the Navy and the Air Service that will distribute them; and the military many who fails in the future to consider gas in every problem he studies is falling to consider the most powerful weapon of war, both for offense and defense.

"There is still talk in places that chemical warfare may be abolished by agreement. It can't be done. If you can abolish chemical warfare by agreement, you can abolish all war by agreement, the way agreement, the can are that have been kept, such as not to use poison bullets or not to poison wells. Such agreements have been kept for one reason, and one reason only. The methods are inefficient. Poisoning of wells is a species of guerilla warfare comparable with stabbing a man in the back, and gets only an occasional casualty. But chemical warfare, getting its casualties by the tens and hundreds of thousands, is too powerful a force for any military commander to overlook, either for offense or defense, and too powerful for any nation to dare trust that no other nation will use it in war. History proves that no powerful method of making war has ever been abandoned until a more powerful method was devised. And why shouldn't we use poison gas? It is just as sportsmanlike to fight with gas as it is to fight with rifles or swords. Gas, being so universally adaptable, requires the highest intelligence and the keenest minds to use it successfully. We Americans believe we have the mind, the skill, and the ingenuity to use it just a little better than anyone else.

"A recent writer in a military magazine stated that gas would probably not be used in our barrage during an attack, because of the difficulty it might cause our own troops. He forgot the enemy—a danger-ous lapse of memory for any military man. Battles have been lest and nations have been swept away because commanders of armies forgot to figure on what t

will deluge our advancing intantry because he knows that him.

"This simply means that gas will be used everywhere, in every battle, and woe be unto the general and his staff who fail to prepare so to use it. No war can be fought without suffering casualties, for, as Napoleon said, 'To make an omelet you must break some eggs.' We recognized that fact when we drove our men so close to our high explosive and shrapnel barrages that we had many casualties from our own shells. Why did we do it? Simply to enable our men to get into the German trenches before the German machine gunners, hiding in deep dugouts, could man the trenches and mow our men down with machine-gun fire at short range.

"CHEMICAL WARFARE IS CHEAP, BUT GERMANS PROVED IT TERRIELE."

deep dugouts, could man the trenches and mow our men down with machine-gun fire at short range.

"Chemical warfare is a very economical method of waging war or maintaining peace. It is doubtful if 15 per cent of the German shells fired at American troops contained gas, yet that 15 per cent of gas shells alone accounted for almost 30 per cent of all our cansatires. The United States spent in the World War for gases, gas masks, gas plants, and all other needs of the Chemical Warfare Service \$120,000,000, less than one-half of 1 per cent of the cost of the war, and yet with that one-half of 1 per cent of the cost of the war, and yet with that one-half of 1 per cent of the cost of the war, and yet with that one-half of 1 per cent of the cost of the war, and yet with that one-half of 1 per cent more than 4,000,000 masks were shipped overseas, sufficient to equip the critic army in France and leave on hand at the signing of the armiticle 1,000,000 masks were shipped to the British and the French and filled into shells by them. Several thousand tons of other chemical-warfare supplies were shipped to France. A number of plants were built, among which is the great plant at Edgewood Arsenal, one of the most valuable war plants in existence in the United States to-day.

"Give the Chemical Warfare Service 2 per cent of the appropriation for the Army, and, if the Navy destres it, 1 per cent of the Navy appropriation, and we believe that we can do as much to guarantee American success in war as could be had with 25 per cent spent in any other way.

"We have developed two new gases that may play a tremendous part in warfare, One is a new cloud gas, transmitted from toxic smoke candles. The old type of cloud gas required the burying of cylinders in deep trenches, requiring the work of many men for many days in order to prepare an attack. This method is obsolete. The modern method is to heat a solid. The solid gas, contained in a simple holder resembling a squat, old-fashioned hantern, is released when a fuse is lighted, it is

Panama Canal and our own seacoast. If the British had had 5,000 tons of it in 1918 they would have stopped the German drive in the first 5 miles.

"Dyphenal-chlorarsine, made of carbolic acid, chlorine, and arsenic, is fired in shells or used in cakes in concentrated form. In high concentration it is deadly. In low concentration it causes severe coughing, pains in the chest, and vomiting. The effects of it simulate pneumonia. It penetrates all save the very latest types of protective masks and a drop or two of the stuff upon a man's clothing will put lim out of action. In defense it could be launched in cloud form against an enemy when the wind was adverse; and the stuff upon a man's clothing will put lim out of action. In defense it could be launched in cloud form against an enemy when the wind causes bilindness from excessive tears. It goes into shells and is spread by beat. This is the gas that will be used in the future to break up mobs, and it should be a tremendous asset to every police department. Mobs are helpless when they can not see. We are at work now upon a substance even more powerful than the tear gas developed by the war. At all times we conduct a warfare among ourselves in the Chemical Warfare Service. We do our best to find a gas that can not be stopped by our most modern masks and clothing. When we find that we invent new masks and new clothing; then look for a more penetrative gas. It is like the "Phosgene is a liquid gas that volatilizes almost instantly. It irritates the lungs very severely and produces symptoms that are familiar to doctors in pneumonia cases. In treating pneumonia patients.

"Lewisite, a new gas discovered by Prof. Lewis of Northwestern University, resembles mustard gas, but is more powerful in burning qualities. It volatilizes even more quickly. We are just beginning to produce it and it will undoubtedly play a large part in the next war.

"These are some of the principal gases that we are constantly experimenting with, and about which we know enongh already to be certai

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, with the unemployed not to be found between the seas, and labor receiving the most munificent reward ever known in the annals of American enterprise, the Republican Party made this solemn platform declaration-

We pledge ourselves to carnest and consistent attack upon the high cost of living-

And that promise was emphasized and dignified as a solemn covenant by its candidate.

We can promise no one remedy which will cure an ill of such wide proportions—

Said candidate Harding in his speech of acceptance-

but we do pledge that earnest and consistent attack which the party platform covenants.

The chairman of the last Republican convention was not less earnest or less emphatic in assuring the people that if intrusted with power his party would keep that covenant, would make "that earnest and consistent attack."

The rise of prices

Said Senator Lodge-

the high cost of living which reach daily into every home is the most pressing as it is the most difficult and most essential problem which confronts us. Some of the sources of this trouble can be reached by legislation, although not all, and everything that can be effected by law should be done at once.

At last, Mr. President, we have the promised legislation. The Republican Party now proposes to solve "the most essential problem which confronts us" by an embargo upon foodstuffs, by piling upon the towering and abhored rates of the Payne-Aldrich bill a higher duty still upon food and raiment, by penalizing every producer of life's essentials who dares to offer food or clothing or shelter to your countrymen except at

the same or a higher figure than it is sold at the place of production or in any other market of the world.

This bill makes a mockery of your President's sacred covenant, your party's solemn pledge, "a promise made to the ear and broken to the hope." The obligation to keep that pledge inviolate is a hundredfold more binding now than then. The promise was made at a time of high wages and universal employment; and now, in the midst of depression and distress, wage cuts on every hand, factories, mines, and mills closed everywhere or working upon reduced time, 5,000,000 desperate, jobless men and their wives and children in destitution and despair demand the fulfillment of that pledge, the keeping of that covenant. Their meager and diminishing savings will no longer sustain the intolerable burden of the existing cost of every essential of life. They are demanding, and they have a right to demand, that promised relief. They ask for bread and you give them a stone. They demand the enactment of legislation cheapening food and clothing and shelter, and you enact a bill deliberately designed to enhance the power of the Wool Trust, the Beef Trust, and the Lumber Trust in maintaining the existing scale of prices.

GROUNDLESS DREAD OF GERMAN COMPETITION.

Alleged dread of German competition is the "bogey man". used by the advocates of high and higher prices to frighten the American consumer into an acceptance of this legislation and a patient endurance of its burdens.

Prior to the Franco-Prussian War the German States exercised but a negligible influence upon international trade, controlling but a bare 7 per cent of the world's commerce. With the formation of the Empire and the acquisition of Lorraine, Germany's foreign commerce, especially her trade in coal and iron, advanced by leaps and bounds. Having despoiled her neighbor of enormous resources in ore and coal, and as ruthless in industrial methods in peace as in military operations in war, Germany did invade the markets of the world and by the most ingenious forms of destructive competition attempted to secure that control, especially over the steel and iron industry, which she had long enjoyed in the production and sale of dyestuffs.

In underselling competitors German industries employed the kartell, resembling in many respects the American trust, but better adapted to the invasion of foreign markets and the de-struction of foreign competition. Under this system the constituent companies, while maintaining their separate organizations, sell to a central agency, and when necessary contribute a bonus in the marketing of a surplus in foreign markets. Behind these formidable combinations stood the Bank of Berlin and the moral support and illimitable resources of a mighty State.

Special reductions and rebates were cheerfully given to export trade, and a great merchant marine was subsidized to carry the German product at the lowest possible cost to the remotest corners of the earth.

Perhaps the most powerful of these kartells, the Central Verband of Dusseldorf, having secured the control of the iron markets of Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and Belgium, boldly attempted to take and to hold the foreign commerce of the world. Starting with a negligible trade, by 1911 Germany had caught and passed her greatest, most formidable rival, controlling 20 per cent of the world's output in iron against 18 of United Kingdom and at the same time becoming her closest competitor in the production of coal. Germany's exportations in the same year reached a total of 6,100,000,000 marks against 4,100,000,000 marks of Great Britain.

This powerful kartell did not hesitate to engage in the most destructive competition or to make any reduction in export prices. Nails selling at 25 marks per hundred kilograms in Germany were offered to the rest of the world at 14 marks. Such practices were openly avowed and boldly maintained by this organization.

Large steel plants-

Said the Verband-

must work to a certain maximum capacity without interruption if they are to remain efficient and produce at a minimum cost. It is impossible for the home market of any plant in any country to absorb a large output without interruption in the flow of orders due to periods of depression from economic causes outside the influence of the steel industry. * * * The Steel Verband therefore maintains that it is better for the entire economic life of the country in slack years at home to dispose of surplus products abroad at prices which may even cause a loss, inasmuch as the loss incurred by dumping abroad is in no comparison to the losses which would be incurred if production were reduced at home.

The bold avowal of such principles and practices was viewed with apprehension by academicians and political economists in

America. David Jayne Hill in the December issue, 1915, of the North American voices an almost hysterical alarm:

In war it is expected that victory will cost a certain loss of life. For the sake of ultimate triumph the state (Germany) is ready to make this sacrifice. Why not then incur temporary losses for the sake of final victory in the bloodless battle of commercial supremacy? More than any other people the Germans were prepared to do this, and did it cheerfully. The same products of iron that in Germany itself sold for 120 marks a ton sold in England, South America, and the Orient for 103 to 110 marks, and in Italy for 75 marks.

What was the effect of this industrial warfare upon the domestic and foreign markets of America? Safely ensconced be-hind a tariff wall at home and abundantly able to take care of himself abroad, the American producer remained secure and serene. Undismayed by this wholesale "dumping" upon the world's markets, the head of the United States Steel Corporation approved the principles and emulated the practices of his German competitor. On June 2, 1911, Judge Gary said:

There is a practice all over the world of dumping, as it is called, surplus products. It is really for the same reason that the merchant at some seasons of the year clears his shelves and sells what he has on hand at less than cost. * * * This export question is a very important one, and I have no doubt this committee will consider it. Now, some years, and, in fact, many years, we do sell export at prices somewhat less than domestic prices, but the total result is that we can afford to sell for domestic consumption at a lower price. All countries do exactly the same thing. The net result is not prejudicial to the domestic purchaser but is a benefit to him.

The American manufacturer entered into active competition with this powerful Verband in the markets of Japan, China, Australia, Cape Colony, and the United Kingdom. According to a report of the commission on German kartells-

In 1890 the United States of America's output of wire was 457,099 tons; in 1902 it was 1,574,293 tons (rising from 1,365,934 tons in 1901 and 846,291 in 1900).

The United States Steel Products Co. exported 5,000 tons of steel a day or 1,500,000 tons per annum, and by 1910 the Steel Corporation's exportations reached the sum of 3,000,000 tons.

Other steel products were not less successful, and everything made of steel, from a wrist watch to a locomotive, American cash registers and typewriters, sewing machines, mowers and twine binders, offered at less than the alleged cost of production at home, found ready sale in the markets of the world in the face of the fierce competition of the German Kartell.

This German invasion of foreign markets was impossible without the aid of concessions and rebates by land carriers and subsidies on the sea.

With the rich ore fields of Lorraine returned to France, the Sahr Valley and the Ruhr region in the clutch of the Allies, railways in ruin, a great merchant marine driven from the sea, and a reparations commission at the throat of the Empire imposing an export tax on what is left of her mills and mines, what have we now to fear from the wrecked industries of this prostrate State? If such an expedient was not necessary to protect the American market from invasion when Germany was at the summit of her industrial and political power, it is worse than useless now.

It is demonstrated by hearings before the Finance Committee and admitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCum-BEEL that there is to-day no threat and no immediate prospect of this dreaded dumping from any country in the world. From whence will it or can it come? What continental country is prepared to supply its own needs, to say nothing of the sale of the necessities of life in markets across the sea? Two-fifths of all the wealth of the world has been obliterated by the rav-ages of war, has disappeared in fire and smoke. Will the ruined factories of Lille or the dismantled mills of Belgium to-morrow arise like a phœnix from their ashes? Are the gaunt peasantry and artisans of France and Belgium, clad in paper and in rags, now prepared to furnish us with soft woolens and fine linens at less than the market price at home or below the cost of production? Are we to apprehend a horrible inundation of beans and rice, eggs and oil from the Orient, while China, desolate and scourged, sees 20,000,000 of her naked populace perish miserably in the skeleton clutch of famine?

LEGISLATION UNNECESSARY.

Hon. William S. Culbertson, member of the Tariff Commission, in a recent and very admirable work entitled "Commercial Policy in War Time and After," inserts a most instructive chapter on antidumping legislation. He defines three kinds of trade practices properly falling under the head of "dumping," as follows:

(1) The sporadic selling of goods in order to relieve a surplus; that is, the offering of bargain sales in international trade;
(2) A permanent policy of foreign industries of selling in this country a portion of their output at a price below their domestic price in order to keep their factories running full time; and
(3) Unfair price cutting, the object of which is to injure, destroy, or prevent the establishment of an American industry.

The sporadic selling of goods in order to relieve a surplus and a custom of selling a portion of the output at less price in foreign than in domestic markets is almost universally practiced and justified by American industries. This act is ostensibly designed to meet the condition described by Mr. Culbertson "as unfair price cutting, the object of which is to injure, destroy, or prevent the establishment of an American industry." Section 201 of the act provides, among other things:

SEC. 201. (a) That whenever the Secretary of the Treasury * * * finds that an industry in the United States is being or is likely to be injured, or is prevented from being established, by reason of the importation into the United States of a class or kind of foreign merchandise * * * sold or is likely to be sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value, then he shall make such finding public to the extent he deems necessary—

And so forth.

This act by the very terms of this preamble is superfluous Under the proposed bill the injured party and unnecessary. is without remedy or relief. The law as now written prohibits such price cutting or unfair practices and provides liberal com-pensation to the domestic competitor for all injuries to his business or property resulting from such practices.

Section 801 of an act approved September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," provides:

provides:

That it shall be unlawful for any person importing or assisting in importing any articles from any foreign country into the United States, commonly and systematically to import, sell, or cause to be imported or sold such articles within the United States at a price substantially less than the actual market value or wholesale price of such articles, at the time of exportation to the United States, in the principal markets of the country of their production, or of other foreign countries to which they are commonly exported, after adding to such charges and expenses necessarily incident to the importation and sale thereof, in the United States: Provided, That such act or acts be done with the intent of destroying or injuring an industry in the United States, or of preventing the establishment of an industry in the United States, or of restraining or monopolizing any part of trade and commerce in such articles in the United States.

"Any person who violates or combines or conspires with any other person to violate this section is guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Any person injured in his hysiness or personets by reason of any yield.

Any person injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of, or combination or conspiracy to violate, this section, may sue therefor in the district court of the United States for the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages sustained, and the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

Trade between individuals and nations alike is, in its last analysis, a mere matter of barter, each converting the commodity produced by labor or by skill into currency for the purpose of facilitating the exchange of values. Just how is the American producer to be bankrupted by the world's offer to give more of the things he needs, more of the necessities of life for the fruit of his toil than can be obtained under existing conditions? Is the American farmer to be impoverished because Germany insists upon giving more potash for his cattle or his corn than she offers to the domestic producer? Is he to be ruined in his business by receiving too much linen from Belgium or silks from France or fruits from Italy or rice and carpets from the Orient in a like exchange?

It is more than incomprehensible, it is an astounding proposition at this time. You have promised to lower the high cost of living and that means nothing more or less than a promise to lower the price of the things upon which we must live. In most instances the American trusts have refused to do it, and by this act you say no other shall.

PERILS OF PROBABLE RETALIATION.

I shall offer an amendment to this bill providing that its antidumping provisions shall apply only to countries which have enacted similar legislation. The Hon, Henry C. Emery, pro-fessor of economics of Yale University and appointed chairman of the United States Tariff Board by President Taft, very pertinently calls the attention of the American public to the imminent danger of retaliation incident to the enactment of such legislation.

What about our own position-

Says he-

says ne—
in regard to selling surplus products abroad? Do we wish to help
start a movement as yet confined to a few sparsely settled colonies
(Canada, Australia, etc.), which will become the practice of our leading
competitors? What would be the position of our own export trade if
all countries should adopt the principle that all goods can not be sold
in foreign markets for less than the established price of the domestic
market? We are in a peculiar position. In general, our domestic prices
are relatively so high that dumping in our market is not so necessary as
in other markets. The foreign manufacturer can commonly meet the
situation by offering his goods at his regular home prices. On the
other hand, prices in foreign markets are so low that the American
exporter is largely driven by the sheer force of international competi-

tion to sell his surplus at some reduction. For this reason I believe the movement for an antidumping law may prove dangerous to American exporters.

The whole fabric of protectionism is based upon the assumption that the cost of production is greater at home than abroad. The minimum of protection is as a rule this alleged difference between the cost of producing a given commodity in a foreign country and in this. If it is not true that the standard of wages is higher in this country than abroad and the cost of production greater, then the whole system of protection is admittedly a sophism and an economic lie.

In that event the importer can now enter American markets without reduction in the price of his commodities. The do-mestic producer, with a higher level of costs and prices, further inflated by the necessary operation of a protective tariff, must sell his surplus abroad at a lower price or he can not sell

it at all.

As Prof. Emery has well said:

Prices in foreign markets are so low that the American exporter is largely driven by the sheer force of international competition to sell his surplus at some reduction.

They who advocate such legislation are blind to the signs of the times and the sweeping changes of a few short years. Yesterday a debtor, to-day a creditor Nation; yesterday an importer, to-day the greatest exporter in the world. The entering of foreign markets is of more vital importance than a tempo-

rary embargo of our own.

I am indebted to the Hon. Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, for ably compiled statistical information showing that while importing less than four billions of foreign merchandise, we are selling eight billions annually abroad. Our imports of manufactured goods are but a little over four hundred and twentyfive millions per annum while our exports of such manufactures, ready for consumption, are over two billion five hundred millions. Our imports of manufactures for the use of manufacturers are about five hundred and seventy millions, our exports of such manufactures are over nine hundred millions.

To carry this colossal traffic we have builded and are maintaining a great merchant marine and for its successful operation we must have something more than ships; we must have cargoes; we must have foreign as well as domestic markets. In the great channels of international trade there are no empty Let the nations of continental Europe emulate our pernicious example and our foreign commerce is dead, our surplus products without a market and our proud ships left to rot

in our ports.

THE EMERGENCY TARIFF.

All tariff legislation necessarily involves the disturbance and disruption of economic conditions. Industries affected by its schedules must be adjusted to it, and it has been hitherto uniformly admitted that such adjustment when made should be as enduring as possible. If this legislation is wise it should be permanent, and if unwise it should not be enacted at all.

It is designed by those who are enacting it not as a boon but as a bait for the farmer, an elusive and temporary relief offered for a few weeks in the vain hope that he may be committed to the pernicious policy of protection, estopped from complaining when inordinate duties are imposed for the benefit of protected industries and inordinate prices demanded by pro-

tected monopolies.

FOLLY OF CANADIAN EMBARGO.

The most pernicious thing in this pernicious bill is the attempted embargo upon Canadian commerce.

Prof. Edward Van Dyke Robinson, of the University of Minnesota, has ably demonstrated the consummate folly of erecting an impassable tariff barrier upon the Canadian border:

In spite of tariff barriers-

Says Prof. Robinson-

Says Prof. Robinson—

a vast and constantly increasing commerce is even now carried on across the Canadian boundary, which argues that each country urgently needs many things which the other produces. Reciprocity by removing or lowering these tariff barriers would consequently tend to increase this mutually profitable commerce. Consider for a moment the location and characteristics of the two countries and it must be apparent that they are designated by nature for mutual dependence and benefit. They lie side by side across the continent, a distance of more than 3,000 miles. No natural barrier separates them. Each side of the boundary is found the same race, the same language, the same customs, the same ideals of social and political justice, even the same scale of Wages and the United States, the investigations of the Tariff Board leave no room for the claim that protection is necessary to equalize differences in wages between the United States and Canada, for between eastern Canada and eastern United States, and Canada, for between eastern Canada and canada, for between eastern Canada and castern United States, western Canada and western United States and Canada, for between eastern Canada, moreover, is by nature merely a portion of a geographic unit, of which the other part lies this side of the boundary.

Thus the Maritime Provinces are physiographically a continuation of New Kagland, the St. Lawrence Valley corresponds to the Hudson Valley, the lands bordering the Great Lakes are alike on the north and

the south, the prairies of Canada are indistinguishable from the Dakotas, and the Pacific slope in Canada reproduces the soil and climate of Washington. Except for the tariff walls which mark the boundary, commerce would flow back and forth along the lines of least resistance, each physiographic province as a whole producing those commodities for which its advantages are greatest and buying from the others those commodities which they in turn are best fitted to produce, precisely as accurs between the several sections of the United States.

Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, Minnesota and Iowa, Washington and Oregon, have prospered without any tariff wall between them, or, rather, have prospered chiefly because of its absence; why not Canada and the United States? What magic power resides in a mere political boundary, when conditions of life are the same on both sides of it, to render necessary or beneficial an obstruction to commerce which no man will deny would be injurious between the seweral States of the Union? The truth is that the same spirit and the same range of vision which demand a tariff wall between adjacent States, adjacent counties, adjacent townships, adjacent farms, for all these compete, yet at the same time and in a larger sense cooperate with one another precisely as Canada and the United States compete and cooperate; and what is beneficial in the one case can not prove injurious in the other. The whole question thus seems to resolve itself to this from the viewpoint of the farmer no less than of society at large: Shall we have the courage to follow established economic principles and extend to a neighboring and closely related country that commercial policy which has long been approved in our own domestic practice, or shall we suffer protection, like conscience, to make cowards of us all?

Developed Canada consists of a narrow band of territory from 200 to 400 miles in width and extending along our northern border for over 3,000 miles. Commerce between the eastern, central, and western Provinces of Canada, separated as they are by lofty mountain ranges and vast stretches of unpeopled wilderness, was for many generations practically impossible. No such barriers existing between these Provinces and the States south of them, the natural course of trade was north and south, the greater advantage accruing to the United States. Her meager manufacturing enterprises confined in the main to the Province of Ontario, inaccessible to the bulk of that vast domain, Canada for half a century vainly knocked at our doors, seeking as a boon the privilege of providing millions of tons of freight for our lake and land carriers, timber and grain for American mills, ores of iron, copper, nickel, and cobalt for American furnaces; hides for American tanneries; and flax and asbestos for American factories.

Purblind protectionism maintained the stubborn barriers in open violation of all the laws of commerce and of common sense, until the Dominion was forced to overcome the almost insurmountable obstacles imposed by nature to the development of her resources, to piece the wilderness, to span estuaries and broad rivers, and surmount the lofty peaks of the Rockies in bringing to her own mills and factories that rich store of raw materials which had been denied admission to our own. For that purpose Canada has constructed three complete transcontinental railway systems—the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Northern—the total trackage of the Dominion amounting in 1916 to 37,000 miles, a per capita mileage twice as great as in the United States and greater than that of any other country in the world except Australia.

Canada is no longer a suppliant at your gates. She no longer begs for the privilege of enriching you. By an enormous outlay of wealth and labor she has diverted the natural course of traffic over more than 3,000 miles of widespread territory and between distant and isolated Provinces. For once an American tariff wall has developed the transportation facilities and manufacturing enterprises of a great country, but it has developed them on the wrong side of the wall. The roads stretch from British Columbia to Quebec and the mills and factories are erected, not in New England but in Ontario.

Canada's refusal to accept the reciprocity agreement of 1911 tendered by the United States has demonstrated the fact that prejudice and a blind worship of the fetish of protection is not confined to this country. Angered by the memory of ancient wrongs and deluded by the sophistry of the industrial interests of Ontario she, too, is capable of the folly of an embargo upon commerce between great countries, whose real interests are reciprocal, rendered mutually beneficial by all the laws of

demolished the traffic between these countries, what will be the effect upon the commercial future of the United States? In this effort to exclude a few bushels of grain is it not well to first count the cost?

Your tariff wall will, in the first place, shut in two dollars of exports to Canada for every dollar's worth of her produce enter-

ing your own markets.

According to a recent report of your Tariff Commission, the exports from the United States to Canada are now second only to exports to Great Britain, and before the war already had equaled those to Germany. America's sales to Canada are more than twice as great as the combined sales to all the countries of South America. Canadian commerce forms approximately one-eighth of the total international trade of the United States, and about equals in volume that with Japan, China, Russia, the East. Indies, and the Philippine Islands combined. The need for imports of foodstuffs and raw materials from Canada has increased with the growth of population; and though the United States buys from Canada hardly more than half as much as she sells, her imports were more than four hundred millions in 1918 and formed almost 15 per cent of the total from all other countries.

I maintain without the fear of successful contradiction that at this time we are in infinitely greater need of Canadian raw materials than of her markets; that we receive a greater benefit from the things we buy than from those we sell; that of the two, the loss of her imports involves a greater injury to American industries and greater hardships to American consumers than even the destruction of our vast export trade to Canada—

approximately, at this time, one billion annually.

For the year ending June 30, 1920, we received from Canada

unfinished products as follows:

Copper to the value of	\$11, 953, 752
Precious metals (except coin and gold bullion)	11, 973, 244
Nickel Asbestos Lumber and timber	7, 533, 437 6, 506, 629 70, 807, 220
Furs and fur skins	16, 594, 434
Besides receiving 1,070,330 cords of pulp wood valued at_	14, 301, 694
Wood pulp, 1,113,954,000 barrels, at	58, 255, 000
Newsprint paper, 1,239,183,470 pounds, at	56, 963, 745

A total value of _____ 253, 989, 155

Is work so plentiful and are our industries so overburdened with unfilled orders that our furnaces and smelters no longer demand the metals and ores of Canada; are cutlery, tools, and domestic utensils so abundant that we no longer need her nickel, silver, and copper? Are homes and building materials so cheap, or rents so low, as to justify the exclusion of her wealth of

lumber and timber?

Consider a prohibitive export duty upon wood pulp and print paper alone. We have spent untold millions in the purchase and protection of vast forest reserves in an earnest effort to preserve our rapidly vanishing timber supply and to conserve the flow of navigable rivers. Forests can be conserved and improved by the scientific cutting of timber for building materials, but the paper mill sweeps the forest as the sickle sweeps the grain. The size of the tree is immaterial. It is all ground into pulp. No other agent has wrought such havoc or denuded such areas as the paper mill. What would be the effect upon American forests should Canada, in retaliation, place an embargo upon the exportation of wood pulp and print paper? Where else in all the world will you secure 2,000,000,000 pounds of wood pulp? Destroy one-half of the available supply of this invaluable commodity, in the face of the present scarcity, and from whence and at what inordinate cost will school children obtain their books, or the publishers of the country the millions of tons essential to supply the magazines and great metropolitan dailies of America? No other commodity, with the possible exception of building materials, iron, and foodstuffs is so absolutely essential to the industrial and intellectual life of America.

It is a source of some surprise that the great manufacturing and industrial enterprises have not more earnestly and more seriously analyzed the commerce between these great countries.

Manufactured exports from Canada, consisting principally of iron and steel products, machinery, and agricultural implements, amounted in 1920 to \$34,112,228.

On the other hand, we exported to Canada in iron, steel manufactures, rolling-mill products, machinery, vehicles, engines, and agricultural implements a total of \$140,272,568.

The total of American imports for 1920, according to figures prepared by the Department of Commerce, totaled \$464,029,014, and our exports for the same time reached a grand total of \$800,632,849. I ask leave to incorporate these tables with my remarks as Exhibit A.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the tables will be incorporated in the RECORD.

The tables are as follows:

Canada (A).—Trade with the United States during the 27 months ending June 39, 1929. (Compiled by the Research Division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, from official Canadian reports.)

IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION.

	Year ending 1919.	Mar. 31, 1920.	AprJune, 1920,	
Iron and steel, and manufactures of	\$177,771,146	\$182,178,251	\$62,380,813	
Rolling-mill products	29,742,889 17,650,234	41,705,392 37,282,659 31,786,952 22,705,319	15, 427, 330 9, 987, 962 11, 092, 988 9, 218, 867	
Agricultural implements	8,903,930	6, 792, 245	2, 638, 086	
Coal	70, 600, 491	60,070,051	15, 678, 688	
Cotton and manufactures of	59, 148, 319	68, 219, 372	21,441,663	
Cotton, raw	34, 004, 891 25, 143, 428 31, 873, 661 31, 511, 604 13, 661, 429	33, 854, 459 34, 364, 915 28, 999, 796 28, 525, 941 12, 753, 761	9,973,553 11,468,110 7,718,034 9,219,398 4,132,671	
Fruits, fresh and dried	20, 211, 707	28, 660, 208	6, 174, 445	
Fruits, fresh	14, 728, 228 5, 483, 479	19, 077, 838 9, 582, 370	5, 504, 695 669, 750	
Wood and manufactures of	18, 270, 072	21, 927, 536	6, 593, 591	
Lumber and timber. Manufactures of wood,	13, 289, 775 4, 980, 297	14, 433, 192 7, 494, 344	- 4, 477, 044 2, 116, 547	
Paper and manufactures of	15, 951, 746	19, 237, 641	5, 404, 614	
Books and printed matter	7, 502, 261 8, 449, 485	9, 892, 516 9, 345, 125	2, 444, 809 2, 959, 805	
Corn	16, 060, 282 10, 325, 820 8, 234, 562	14, 215, 787 12, 787, 163 10, 780, 775	2, 819, 429 3, 697, 528 4, 499, 823	
Total imports	750, 203, 024	801, 632, 849	221, 465, 675	

EXPORTS OF CANADIAN PRODUCE.

Wood and manufactures of	\$88, 544, 539	\$102,980,859	\$36, 385, 829
Lumber and timber	57, 366, 207	70, 807, 220	22, 381, 774
Chemical	26, 256, 265	25,550,882	11,027,121
Mechanical	4, 418, 555	5,765,871	2,710,867
Paper (except printed matter)	38, 621, 265	50, 367, 339	15, 463, 389
Cattle	29, 857, 668	44,021,587	1,043,126
Chemicals and allied products	68, 408, 028	21, 129, 706	2,672,498
Cartridges	37, 855, 417	7,016,804	
Explosives	19, 289, 483	4,070,595	294, 854
Iron and steel	25, 888, 731	26,699,530	6,690,983
Machinery	5, 403, 742	4, 229, 620	468,093
Agricultural implements	272,927	3, 283, 078	1,847,504
Copper Fish and shellfish	20, 130, 583	11, 953, 752	2, 511, 760
Fish and shellfish	17, 600, 764	17, 180, 250	3, 266, 591
Hides and skins	7,651,052	19, 738, 005	1, 535, 259
Furs and fur skins	9, 743, 464	16, 594, 534	2, 428, 998
Wheat Precious metals (except coins and gold bul-	4, 203, 920	14,000,932	285, 837
lion)	17, 117, 730	11, 073, 244	1, 739, 983
Meats	- 8, 916, 737	8, 479, 065	2, 554, 817
Nickel	8, 476, 111	7, 533, 437	2, 056, 681
Asbestos	6, 890, 724	6, 506, 629	2, 159, 368
Oats	7, 360, 011	3, 300, 477	3, 846, 380
Potatoes	1,643,855	6, 819, 405	6, 528, 612
Linseed	6, 323, 484	4, 714, 919	120, 132
Total domestic exports	454, 873, 170	464, 029, 014	113, 133, 027
Total foreign exports	22, 822, 489	37, 099, 354	6, 888, 393

Mr. STANLEY. It is claimed that in the face of a sudden emergency the farmer must have instant relief from an inundation of agricultural products from Canada, and that the American consumer is to be impoverished by an excess of cheap foodstuffs from the Dominion. Those who make this claim are ignorant of the nature of this commerce, or forget that our exports of agricultural products to Canada vastly exceed our imports.

In 1920 we shipped to Canada 1,211,831 boxes of oranges, valued at \$6,066,962; 13,902,863 pounds of prunes, valued at \$1,997,914; and 26,831,775 pounds of raisins, valued at \$4,890,294. Other fruits, fresh and dried, shipped to Canada

in 1920, amounted to \$21,065,619.

For the same period we shipped 10,454,931 pounds of cotton and manufactures thereof, valued at \$34,636,310; oil cake and oil-cake meal valued at \$6,606,854; our exports of tobacco were valued at \$9,310,976; our tobacco imports for the same period amounting to \$65,878. We exported onions to the value of \$465,826, our imports for the same period being \$7,389.

Our total exports of the articles enumerated above amounted to \$85,114,545, and our imports to \$73,267, giving the American

agriculturist a balance of \$84,967,488.

I ask leave to insert at the conclusion of my remarks tables containing a complete and exhaustive summary of the interchange of agricultural products between the United States and Canada, from 1910 to 1920, inclusive, covering the exportation and importation of seeds, corn, grain, flour, vegetables, fruits, fresh and dried, cotton and wool, cattle and hogs, fresh and cured meats, and so forth. For the year 1920 this summary shows an excess of exports over imports of \$62,967,488, and now this half-baked and so-called emergency bill proposes to relieve the farmers and gardeners of the United States by the instant and utter demolition of this splendid balance in their favor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the tables referred to will be printed at the conclusion of the Senator's re-

marks.

CANADIAN WHEAT,

Mr. STANLEY. The fear of the dumping of Canadian wheat upon the American market is the only reason yet assigned or assignable for this embargo upon Canadian commerce. Canada never has and she never can dump any material portion of her grain upon the American market, and if she did it could not appreciably affect the price in this country. The price of wheat in Canada, as in the United States, is necessarily determined by the price of the surplus from each country; and this surplus being sold in the same market and under practically identical conditions, it is a matter of small importance whether it is shipped from Montreal or Chicago. In each case, broadly speaking, it must necessarily bring the Liverpool price, less the cost of transportation.

A study of the ebb and flow of grain across the Canadian border shows that its movement is determined by freight rates or other local conditions rather than by any marked or permanent difference in the price level of the two countries, and that on the whole there is no material difference between exports

and imports

From 1910 to 1920, inclusive, Canada exported to the United States 58,468,248 bushels of wheat. During the same period she imported from us 50,406,748 bushels of wheat, leaving a net excess for the 10-year period of 8,061,503 bushels. In other words, during this period Canada on the average "dumped" annually into the United States a net excess of about 800,000 Just how 800,000 bushels, or 8,000,000 bushels, could disturb the general level of prices on six or seven hundred million bushels of American wheat is inconceivable. I ask leave to include in my remarks in the RECORD a table showing the movement of wheat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be in-

cluded in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

(B.)—Exports from the United States to Canada and imports into the United States from Canada of wheat.

[(+) Excess of exports over imports; (-) excess of imports over exports.]

Wheat.	Exports.	Imports.	Trade balance.	July 1, 1909, to Nov. 30, 1920.	
Fiscal year 1910fbushels	2,111,370 2,317,191	152, 383 135, 441	+ 1,958,987	(+) 1,958,987	
Fiscat year 1911	1, 256, 783 1, 242, 707	502, 829 467, 282	+ 753, 954	753,954 87,550	
Fiscal year 1912bushels	537, 240 489, 194	2,673,050 2,186,685	- 2,135,810	2, 223, 050 19, 293, 811	
Fiscal year 1913 bushels	851, 139 829, 447	763, 589 530, 905	+ 87,550	571,649 25,517,744	
Fiscal year 1914 Sbushels	4, 124, 701 3, 831, 719	1, 891, 651 1, 682, 654	+ 2,223,050	50, 406, 745	
Fiscal year 1915 bushels	19, 664, 674 19, 941, 388 6, 244, 732	370, 863 420, 372 5, 673, 083	+ 19, 293, 811	(-) 2,135,810	
Fiscal year 1916 bushels bushels bushels	7, 430, 824 4, 714, 836	5, 766, 227 23, 715, 293	-19,000,457	19,000,457 24,437,565	
Fiscal year 1917dollars	9, 856, 529 252, 540	41, 374, 943 24, 690, 105	-24, 437, 565	3, 923, 662 8, 970, 754	
Fiscal year 1918dollars Six months, 1918, July-fbushels	577, 965 26, 478, 814	51, 820, 536 961, 070	+25, 517, 744	58, 468, 248	
Decemberdollars	61, 430, 715 1, 421, 613	1, 962, 245 5, 345, 275	- 3, 923, 662	1 8, 061, 503	
Calendar year 1919dollars Eleven months ending bushels	3, 314, 818 14, 800, 945	11, 293, 079 23, 771, 699	- 8,970,754		
Nov. 30, 1920(dollars	41, 262, 739	53, 795, 252			

Net excess of imports over exports in bushels.

Mr. STANLEY. This duty of 35 cents per bushel is imposed for the double purpose of stopping the Canadian influx of grain and of increasing by that amount the market price of American wheat. If the impossible should happen and American wheat

should advance as a result of this tariff 35 cents a bushel over the Canadian product, it would not stop the shipment of a single grain, for the simple reason that the shipper having paid the import duty would immediately recover it in the higher price paid in the American market.

We have just exported a surplus of 210,000,000 bushels of wheat. If this tariff raises the price of this commodity by 35 cents a bushel, no producer will ship any part of it abroad to be sold in a lower and an unprotected market, and in order to maintain this artificially created price level, every man, woman, and child in the United States will be compelled to consume at the higher price approximately one-half barrel of flour more next year than this. Unless this does occur, the unsold surplus in the United States will necessarily depress the price to the level of the Canadian and Liverpool markets, tariff or no tariff.

The truth is that wheat imported from Canada has been sent to mill rather than to market. The great mills in Duluth and Minneapolis produce a finer grade of flour by mixing the hard wheats of Canada with the softer grain raised in the States. Minneapolis mills between September 1, 1918, and August 31, 1919, received 75,000,000 bushels of grain, producing 16,554,000 barrels of flour and 1,224,000,000 pounds of feedstuff.

Let us assume that during the ensuing year Canada should ship into the United States 50,000,000 bushels of grain. It would not affect the price of the commodity one cent on the bushel.

It seems that only those industries which walk upon crutches can command the aid or the sympathy of the protectionist. These mills are importing wheat and exporting flour with the result that more than half a million tons of invaluable feedstuffs, made in considerable part from Canadian wheat, are available for the America producer of cattle and hogs and for the American dairyman. If 50,000,000 bushels annually of Canadian wheat should be imported into the United States, ground in American mills by American labor, millions of tons of this rich animal feed could be offered to the stock raiser. Is the stock raiser producing beef and pork or the dairyman milk and butter so cheaply that we must by legislation deprive him of the product of these great mills upon which he now depends for the maintenance of his herds and dairies?

CONDEMNED BY TARIFF COMMISSION.

For a decade the Republican Party has boasted that it was the creator and preserver of that sacred institution, the Tariff Commission. Again and again, in platform declarations, you have solemnly pledged the American people that you would take this issue out of politics, that you would not attempt to change schedules vitally affecting the revenues and the industries of the Nation without first calling into your councils staid and dispassionate philosophers and learned political economists far removed from the bias and personal ambition of the mere politician. Has the Tariff Commission been consulted about this iniquitous thing? I challenge you to find on or off the Tariff Commission any political economist, still preserving his intellectual integrity and professional self-respect, who will vouch for this naked piece of political demagogy, this transparent sham,

In their platforms of 1912 reactionaries and progressives alike pledged their allegiance to a tariff commission, the

regulars declaring:

To accomplish this (tariff revision) correct information is indispensable. This information can best be obtained by an expert commission. * * * To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of the tariff board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it.

The progressives were even more emphatic:

We pledge ourselves to the establishment of a nonpartisan scientific tariff commission, reporting both to the President and to either branch of Congress. * * * We believe that this commission should have plenary power to elicit information, and for this purpose to prescribe a uniform system of accounting for the great protected industries.

In 1916 a reunited Republicanism repeated the pledges:

We favor the creation of a tariff commission with complete power to gather and compile information for the use of Congress in all matters relating to the tariff.

The United States Tariff Commission has compiled two volumes containing more than 200 pages on the one subject of this proposed embargo upon Canadian grain, graphically presenting to this Congress the manifest advantage to the milling interests of America of an untrammeled opportunity to avail themselves of the hard Canadian wheat that, while fostering the cattle-producing and dairy interests, they may give to the consumer the staff of life of a better quality and at a lower cost.

This free movement of wheat-

Says the commission-

Says the commission—
between the United States and Canada, making the North American crop a common source of supply, has certain demonstrable advantages.

* * * American elevators, distributing interests, and rail and ocean lines enjoy the benefits accruing from this larger volume of traffic; domestic mills, which had been losing ground to Canada in the export flour trade, are able to meet this competition through importing Canadian wheat for blending and milling; a larger volume of mill feed is available to the dairy industry, which consumes more mill feed than is yielded as a by-product of domestic flour consumption.

Your cours commission has nitilessly exposed the transcevent.

Your own commission has pitilessly exposed the transparent folly of attempting to enhance the price of six or seven hundred million bushels of American wheat by excluding a few thousand carloads of Canadian grain from a Minneapolis mill.

Says this report-

Says this report—
from the question of price levels, however, it may be said with some certainty that inasmuch as the United States is on an exporting basis any wheat that is imported from Canada (aside from the question of special cases to meet special needs) released an equal amount of American wheat for export. This being true, it is not a matter of great importance whether the Canadian wheat reaches Europe directly or indirectly through the United States either in the form of flour or by releasing similar American wheat. Indeed, if we may assume that the European demand is controlling our market, as it does in normal times when we are on an exporting basis, there is a possibility that if the Canadian wheat has been thrown on the English market before the close of Lake navigation, instead of filtering slowly through the United States, the world price level, and therefore our own market, would have been depressed more than it was in the fall of 1920. From this point of view it seems fortunate for American producers that there was a buffer between the great Canadian surplus and the Liverpool market.

If this country were on a net importing basis, the prices obviously would be depressed by the imports from Canada, but at a time when heavy exports are going out of the country the relatively small imports probably do not alter the general rule that it is of no great importance to the American producer whether Canadian wheat reaches the European markets directly or indirectly through the United States. To the Canadian grower, however, access to the great American markets, to the mills, and to the shipping facilities south of the border is obviously a factor of substantial importance.

I am not surprised that the authors of this measure have submitted it to the consideration of the Senate in silence, if not in shame. The more discerning, I fancy, even now catch a glimmer of the handwriting on the wall. I assure the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber that, as a partisan, I can rejoice that you make this nostrum of protection a panacea for all the ills of the farm and factory and that you dare not put it to this practical and acid test. The farmer will be enlightened, not deluded, by the object lesson. Find he will, as find he must, that the value of these great, great staples whose sale is found and whose price is fixed in the open and competitive markets of the world is not dependent upon a tariff schedule. The tobacco grower in Kentucky and Tennessee, in Virginia and the Carolinas, herdsmen from Texas to Montana, the planter in the corn belt of Illinois, and the wheat grower on the Dakota prairies will learn, and shortly, too, that they are as little affected by the bogus schedules of this bill as by the precession of the equinox or the movement of the stars.

This act will demonstrate that protectionism-in the hands of trusts and monopolies the most facile instrument of extortion yet devised by the wit of man-is utterly impotent when applied to the cotton and cattle, the corn and grain of the American producer. It will demonstrate that while it can despoil, it can not defend; while it can plunder, it can not protect him.

The dupes of this doctrine in agricultural States will awaken to-morrow sadder and wiser men, and peradventure they will survey with a broader and keener vision the operations of these same gentlemen when they meet a few months hence to appor-tion, not for 6 months but for 60 years, if need be, to special interests and pampered monopolies those rewards which their political activities may have deserved or your political obligations may demand.

APPENDIXES C AND D.

Imports into United States from Canada and exports from United States to Canada (if specified commodities in United States trade with Canada).

[(+) Excess of exports over imports; (-) excess of imports over exports.]

		Fiscal year 191	0.	(W) yes	Fiscal year 1911.			Fiscal year 1912.		
	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	
Wheat:	0.111.070	150 000	1 1 070 007	1 of a floo	500.000			0 000 000		
Bushels	2,111,370 \$2,317,191	152,383 \$135,441	+ 1,958,987	1,256,783 \$1,242,707	502, 829 \$467, 282	+ 753,954	537, 240 \$489, 194	2,673,050 \$2,186,685	2,135,810	
BarrelsValue	49,981 \$235,866	143, 830 \$676, 366	- 93,849	42,947 \$189,490	141, 405 \$624, 373	- 98,458	99,760 \$419,033	158, 286 \$661, 758	- 58,526	
Rye: Bushels Value	1,081 \$1,414			1,192 \$1,079			5,484 84,769			
Rye flour: Barrels	2,246			4, 289			3,485			
Value Cern: Bushels	\$8,629 6,178,896	HTTT TOTAL		\$15,676			\$13,010 9,568,574	11 077	+ 9,557,497	
Value	\$4,048,006			13, 409, 580 \$7, 289, 843			\$6,568,671	\$12,824	- 9,557,497	
NumberValue	10, 283 \$323, 274	5, 574 \$152, 738	+ 4,709	7, 890 \$257, 934	3, 043 \$136, 359	+ 4,847	6,705 \$244,918	1, 350 \$86, 371	+ 5,355	
Flaxseed: BushelsValue	344 \$740	1, 410, 398 \$2, 641, 256	- 1,410,054	656 \$1,721	2, 251, 083 \$5, 178, 291	- 2, 250, 427	4,009 \$11,263	3, 510, 883 \$6, 608, 312	- 3, 506, 874	
Eggs: Dozens	868, 454	39, 810	+ 828,644	2, 457, 188 \$474, 350	35, 272	+ 2,421,916	8,697,568 \$1,932,975	25, 817	+ 8,671,751	
Value	\$202, 344 14, 897	\$12,596 1,911,925	- 1,897,028	4312,000	\$15, 052 1, 214, 661	- 1, 214, 661	\$1,932,973	\$15,078 637,128	- 637, 128	
ValuePetatoes:	\$1,421	\$484, 389		995 704	1, 214, 661 \$288, 308 23, 832		050 979	\$151, 588		
BushelsValueMeats and fresh beef:	207, 764 \$146, 727	\$36,770	+ 110,626	335, 724 \$244, 997		+ 311,892	256, 373 \$339, 818	143, 059 \$128, 076	+ 113, 314	
PoundsValue	136,389 \$13,148			247,598 \$25,777			585, 222 \$77, 769			
Fresh mutton: Pounds Value	780,761 \$80,300			991,480 \$96,772			2,077,535 \$188,734			
Fresh pork: Pounds	77,713 \$8,931			206,559 \$24,745			890, 926 \$95, 687			
Bacon and hams: Pounds	4,395,632 \$717,535			4,609,598 \$778,182			9,623,877 \$1,387,864			
Total meats, pounds	5,390,495	3221101101010		6,055,226						
Fruits, fresh and dried: Apples, dried—										
Pounds	104,885 \$8,722			266,792 \$22,985			281,296 \$27,680			
Value	68,920 \$279,290			155,081 \$502,959			206, 857 \$736, 015			
Apricots, dried— Pounds Value.	1,134,547 \$102,063			1,155,007			902,645 \$113,571			

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE.



Imports into United States from Canada and exports from United States to Canada, etc.—Continued.

	Fiscal year 1910.				Fiscal year 1911.			Fiscal year 1912.		
	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	
Fruits, fresh and dried—Continued.						EX CONTRACT				
Bananas-		9.047			0.000		E Committee	10 000	N X	
Bunches		2,047 \$2,048			9,626 \$7,680			10,299 \$6,936		
Berries, value										
Currants— Pounds		81			300			385	A STATE OF THE STA	
Value		\$7			\$26			\$46		
Pounds		4, 988			154, 051			10,921		
Value		\$365			\$7,370			\$461		
Figs-		43,079			21, 353			8 300	1	
PoundsValue		\$1,724			\$703			8,300 \$655		
Grapes—		3, 473			3,974			9 910		
Cubic feet		\$2,802			\$5,022			3, 319 \$3, 381		
Lemons, value		\$3, 479			\$5,176			\$3, 883		
Olives— Gallons		163			2,430			2,900		
Value		\$163			\$1,257			\$1,877		
Oranges— Boxes	801, 260	No constitution and		1, 132, 760			1, 152, 866			
Value	\$2,047,477	\$1,545			\$3,094		\$2,877,665	\$383		
Peaches, dried—	1,913,922		Carrier Ton	3, 141, 006			9 001 975			
PoundsValue	\$101,689			\$203,024			2,021,375 \$182,247			
Pears, green or ripe, value	\$121, 199			\$163,083			\$234, 514			
Prunes, dried— Pounds	10, 583, 094			8, 837, 132			13, 503, 157			
Value	\$415,668			\$176, 826			\$850, 810			
Raisins—			The state of the s	2500 1000 1000	***					
Pounds	6,086,327 \$279,709	311 \$17		11,001,209 \$592,405	686 \$42		11, 850, 394 \$774, 809	3,613 \$320		
Value	\$1, 278, 451	\$246,574		\$1,644,254	\$133, 210		\$2,315,693	\$155, 417		
Total fruits, value	\$4,634,268	\$258 724	+ \$4,375,544	\$6, 548, 444	\$163 560	+ \$6,384,884	\$8, 113, 004	\$173,359	+ \$7,939,645	
Total fruits, value	#1, 031, 203	9400,121	7 \$1,010,011	90,010,111	\$105,000	T 00,001,001	90,110,001	9110,009	+ \$1,939,040	
Cotton, unmanufactured:					-			Ell Total		
Sea Island— Pounds				175, 838			143, 151			
Value				\$50,727			\$34,418			
. Upland and other—	62 706 152			78, 236, 198			90, 689, 048			
PoundsValue	62,796,152 \$8,936,006			\$11, 387, 372			\$9,167,671			
Total— Pounds	62, 796, 152	46, 422	+ 62.749.730	78, 412, 036	771 316	+ 77,640,720	90, 832, 199	174,845	+ 90,657,354	
Value	\$8,936,006	\$10,301	+ 62,749,730 + \$8,925,705	\$11,438,099	\$122,326	+ 77,640,720 +\$11,315,773	\$9, 202, 089	\$21,387	+ 90,657,354 + \$9,180,702	
Oil cake and oil-cake meal:										
Corn-						-		S		
Pounds	62,010 \$938				************		56, 448			
ValueCotton seed—	4900						\$896			
Cake—			and the state of						1 3 mm	
PoundsValue	2, 535, 150 \$36, 698			3, 196, 582 \$45, 568			6, 138, 200 \$85, 222			
Meal—	400,000			\$10,000			400, 222			
Pounds										
Value							• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
Cake-	440,000		1 3 5 5 6	200 0000			The state of		2.1	
Pounds	929, 925			355, 060			1, 688, 318			
Value Meal—	\$12,914			\$4,790			\$26, 323			
Pounds										
Value										
All other— Pounds							11, 220			
Value							\$118			
Total (import figures do not in- clude meal):	PROPERTY.	- A		10 20 20 20 3						
Pounds	3,527,085	77,808	+ - 3, 449, 277	3, 551, 642	77,600	+ 3,474,042	7, 894, 186	669,990		
Value	\$50,550	\$971	+ \$49,579	\$50,358	\$947	+ \$49,411	\$112,559	\$10,011	+ \$102,548	
Sugar: Cane—										
Pounds		25,719			1,440			3, 850, 446		
Value		\$575			\$97			\$114,505		
Total—										
Pounds		25,719	+ 221,385 + \$9,222	408, 283 \$19, 213	1,440	+ 406,843 + \$19,116	431, 066 \$32, 011	3, 850, 446	- 3,419,380 - \$82,491	
Value	93, 131	\$575	7 90, 222	\$19,210	401	T . \$15,110	402,011	\$114,505	- 802, 191	
Tobacco:	DECEMBER 188	Hart State Control	DE LA CONTRACTOR	E THE STATE OF		A STATE OF	2 2 2 2 2 2	1000	F	
Leaf, suitable for cigar wrappers— Pounds.	and the same of th	140, 196			63, 195		Security Commence	42,559		
Value		\$141,266			\$66,909					
Other leaf— Pounds		318,561		and the same of th	99,307		1	72,301		
Value		\$110,576			\$45,904			\$42,307		
Total leaf— Pounds	12 201 474	450 757	1 10 740 747	10 454 000	169 509	+ 13,291,561	15,095,925	714 900	+ 14,981,065	
Value	13, 201, 474 \$1, 878, 087	458,757 \$251,842	+ 12,742,717 + \$1,626,245	13,454,063 \$1,854,707	\$112,813	+ \$1,741,894	\$2,335,466	\$114,518	+ \$2,220,948	
		-	,		33		1		-,,-	
Stems and trimmings— Pounds		EV PLOTED	12000		31,460	E CHESTON	THE STATE OF THE			
Value					\$68					
Cigars and cheroots—			101 - 201				108		and a second	
A HOUSEHUS	199	***********			************			*************		
PoundsValue	\$6,448	6			32		\$5,150	9		

Imports into United States from Canada and exports from United States to Canada, etc .- Continued.

		Fiscal year 191	0.		Fiscal year 191	1.		Fiscal year 191	2.	
	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports,	Imports.	Balance.	
l'obacco-Continued.				DE LA COMPANIA	MISS S					
Cigarettes— Thousands	467			one	1000	- C. C.				
Pounds				***********			1,107	50		
Value	\$1,751	311		\$4,319			\$4,425	\$270		
Pounds	151,907			208,641			216,017			
Value Smoking—	\$60,848	************		\$83,186			\$92,766			
Pounds	87,358 \$33,179	***********		\$8,348 \$46,076			115,590			
All other, value	\$24,555	\$4,962		\$15,261			\$58,927 \$13,892	\$2,971		
Total, value	\$2,004,868	\$256,828	+ \$1,748,040	\$2,010,027	\$117,201	+ \$1,892,826	\$2,627,827	-	+ \$2,510,047	
Onions:		Section 1						7,00,720	1 40,010,01	
Bushels	102, 390 \$68, 761	2,439 \$3,404	+ 99, 951 + \$65, 357	94, 560 \$87, 475	633 \$792	+ 93,927 + \$86,683	180, 817	2,118	+ 178, 69: + \$158, 62	
Value Paper (newsprint):	000000000					H. C. C.	\$154, 129	\$3, 509	+ \$156,62	
Pounds. Value.	9, 613, 685 \$433, 709	\$6, 766, 027 \$1, 615, 100	- 77, 152, 342 - \$1, 181, 391	5, 986, 272 \$139, 975	106, 215, 212 \$1, 968, 385	-100, 228, 940 - \$1, 828, 410	9, 273, 444 \$196, 172	\$2, 101, 023	- 101, 851, 991 - \$1, 904, 851	
Pulp wood: Cords.		1, 000, 342			20070000	4,500,000	4100,112	Carroll entrees	- \$1,904,80	
Value		\$6, 392, 023			\$69, 955 \$5, 565, 273			901, 270 \$5, 834, 828		
Wood pulp: Tons	1, 355	184, 088	- 182, 733	1,357	257 580	_ 956 993	1,750	100000000000000000000000000000000000000		
Value	1, 355 \$49, 290	\$4, 224, 500	- 182, 733 - \$4, 175, 210	\$47, 422	\$5, 352, 316	- \$5, 304, 894	\$54, 878	\$4,753,980	= \$4,698,200	
		Fiscal year 191	3.		Fiscal year 191	4.	Piscal year 1915.			
	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports,	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	
Wheat:					10000					
BushelsValue	851, 139 \$829, 447	763, 589 \$530, 905	+ 87,550	4, 124, 701	1,891,651	+ 2,233,050	19,664,674	370, 863	+ 19, 293, 811	
Wheat flour:	I III. OCCUPATIONS	A SHARE TO COME		\$3, 831, 719	\$1,682,654		\$19,941,388	\$420,372		
Barrels	98,665 \$450,104	106, 527 \$445, 993	- 7,862	122,752 \$539,942	\$8,911 \$356,316	+ 33,841	\$592,011	62,494 \$302,141	+ 48,441	
Bushels	85,596			66,997			47, 261			
ValueRye flour:	\$60,190			\$45,566			\$44,953			
BarrelsValue	4, 298 \$16, 763			6, 835 \$24, 792			6,189			
orn:		200000000000000000000000000000000000000	211000000000000000000000000000000000000				\$ 30,037	I WALL WALL		
Bushels	8,097,882 \$4,766,805	2,828 \$3,222	+ 8,095,054	4,641,737 \$3,328,785	\$13,552	+ 4,625,847	8, 238, 156 \$6, 154, 904	155, 418	+ 8, 082, 738	
Tattle: Number	11,691	29,186	- 17,495	8,957	241,331			and the second second	100000	
Value	\$391,644	\$1,026,301		\$330,005	\$8,697,137	- 232,374	751 \$48,854	191,540 \$9,285,277	- 190,780	
Flaxseed: Bushels	69	4,732,316	- 4,732,247		8,647,168	- 8,647,168	1,169	6,629,860	8 890 801	
Value	\$119	\$7,187,547		,	\$10,561,662	***********	\$2,444	\$8,843,489	- 6,628,691	
Dozens	12,856,690 \$2,746,091	16, 894	+ 12,839,796	9, 064, 948	356, 962	+ 8,707,986	6, 116, 988	735, 625	+ 5,381,363	
Value	\$2,746,091	\$17,037		\$2,215,958	* \$84,876		\$1,393,863	\$168,714	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Pounds		311,735	- 311,735	38	4, 857, 660	- 4,857,622	1,787,973	7,565,072	- 5,777,099	
ValuePotatoes:	Name of Street	\$63, 186		\$7	\$1,110,324		\$573,329	\$1,723,921		
Bushels	372,656 \$333,455	119, 493 \$42, 696	+ 253,163	396, 870 \$297, 002	1,025,536 \$459,782	- 628,666	488,587	82, 431	+ 406, 156	
Value Meats and fresh beef:		412,000		777			\$381,777	\$27,863		
PoundsValue	\$98,061			253,781 \$39,336	15,919,799 \$1,368,113	- 15,666,018	545,356 \$66,528	15, 305, 264 \$1, 575, 633	- 14,759,908	
Fresh mutton: Pounds.	4,198,979			3,911,675						
Value	\$472,039			\$432,012	112,804 \$14,433	+ 3,798,871	2,545,320 \$298,713	479,522 \$63,672	+ 2,065,798	
Fresh pork: Pounds	580, 329			232.068	4,602,415	- 4,370,347		16,181,702	- 16,135,558	
Value	\$69,542			232,968 \$27,313	\$537,928		46,144 \$4,483	\$2,003,588	20,100,000	
Pounds	13,653,957 \$2,053,363			15,089,579	1,314,093	+ 13,775,486	11,539,844	7, 234, 262	+ 4,305,582	
Value				\$2,317,243	\$211,115		\$1,582,878	\$1,085,629		
Total meats, pounds	19,073,343			19,487,163	21,949,111	- 2,462,008	14, 676, 664	39, 200, 750	- 24,524,086	
Fruits, fresh and dried: Apples, dried—										
Pounds	360, 318			211, 452			250, 834		1	
Value	\$21, 389		,	\$15, 193			\$18,070			
Barrels	376, 951			299, 347			318,840			
Value	\$913, 506			\$1,040,413	TENNING NO.		\$738, 825			
Pounds Value	1,440,065 \$126,199			955, 861 \$106, 313			1,428,725 \$119,589		Management of the State of the	
Banauas— Bunches		4 000		4100,010			4114, 009			
Value		4,398 \$4,111			1,993 \$2,638			2, 611 \$2, 459		
Berries, value	\$554,315			\$688, 244			\$510, 564			
Pounds		989			119			97		
Dates—		\$99			\$10			\$9		
PoundsValue		40,969 \$2,017			1,296			15,030		
Figs-					\$36		••••••	\$889		
Pounds	PRODUCTOR PROSPECT	103	VERY DESCRIPTION OF THE		11,722			12,711		

Imports into United States from Canada and exports from United States to Canada, etc.—Continued.

	F	iscal year 1913		F	iscal year 1914			Fiscal year 191	5.
	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
Fruits, fresh and dried-Continued.									
Grapes— Cubic feet		4,256			513			340	
Value	\$359,968	\$4,214 \$22,431		\$279,953	\$721 \$23,610		\$292,062	\$904 \$2,937	
Lemons, valueOlives—				4210,000	1000		9202,002		
GallonsValue		3, 121 \$1, 846			3, 331 \$2, 164			1,402 \$1,012	************
Oganges-				1, 491, 539			1, 682, 824		
Boxes	1,017,545 \$2,837,507	\$1,538		83, 611, 563	\$139		\$3, 643, 152	\$221	
Peaches, dried— Pounds	2, 365, 345			2, 505, 201			2, 243, 758		
Value	\$132,850			\$128,790			\$101,526		
Pears, green or ripe, value	\$283, 288			\$352, 515			\$258, 902		
Prunes, dried Pounds	10, 956, 827 \$488, 566			12, 757, 585 \$697, 718			9, 321, 355 \$562, 102		
Value	SC22400000								
PoundsValue	18, 082, 522 \$869, 596	147 \$13		10, 871, 150 \$683, 326	665 \$87		15, 439, 231 \$1, 017, 375	77, 357 \$6, 078	
All other, except preserved, value	\$1,742,959	\$146, 495		\$1,981,080	\$171,716		\$1,615,987	8173, 563	
Total fruits, value	\$8, 330, 143	\$182,769	+ \$8, 147, 374	\$9, 588, 108	\$200,960	+ \$9,387,148	\$8, 881, 154	\$189,761	+ \$8,601,393
Cotton, unmanufactured:									
Sea island—								The Property of	The State of
PoundsValue	54,797 \$14,160	***********		441, 956 \$97, 620			854, 465 \$169, 139		
Upland and other—			*******				86, 609, 761		
PoundsValue	75, 952, 419 \$8, 975, 431			75, 054, 383 \$9, 497, 485			\$7,416,912		
Linters— Pounds				Se roci		60.37	3, 930, 856		
Value							\$120, 497		
Total:				DOMESTIC STATE		1			
Pounds	76, 997, 216 \$8, 989, 591	1, 261	+ 76,005,955 + \$8,989,388	. 75, 496, 339 \$9, 595, 105		+ 75, 496, 339 + \$9, 595, 105	91,395,082 \$7,706,548	2,400	+ 91,392,682 + \$7,706,471
Value	\$5, 959, 591	\$200	+ 95, 959, 365	\$9, 393, 103		+ 49, 595, 105	\$1,100,045	911	+ \$1,100,411
Oil cake and oil-cake meal: Corn—									
Pounds	935, 000								
ValueCotton seed—	\$14,561	**********		***********	************		**********	***********	
Cake— Pounds	7, 590, 495			6, 772, 300		13.4	574, 000		
Value	\$112,309						\$7, 158		
Meal— Pounds						100000141	22, 268, 838		
ValueLinseed or flaxseed—							\$305, 775		
Cake-			and the						DENTANT CO
PoundsValue	812,996 \$11,888			584, 455 \$9, 180			545, 460 \$8, 308		
Meal—	411,000	100 100 100 100	MARIE THE PROPERTY OF	90,100			40,000		200
Pounds Value							•••••	•••••	
All other—	1 50000 10000			700 000			Section States		
PoundsValue	587, 370 \$9, 058			760, 030 \$11, 299			\$49, 280 \$11, 616	3	
Total (import figures do not in-									
clude meal):	0.00= 001	050 007		0 440 505	0.000.100	* ****	01 007 270	010 005	
Pounds	9,925,861 \$147,816	956,037 \$12,987	+ \$,969,824 + \$134,829	\$,116,785 \$119,400	2,390,180 \$22,940	+ 5,725,605 + \$96,460	24, 237, 578 \$332, 857	\$40,687 \$13,165	+ 23,396,891 + \$319,692
Sugar:									
Beet-		-			2 4 4	The state of			The same
PoundsValue.		472, 498 \$10, 395			1,010		••••••	9,811	
Cane— Pounds		2,167			4,970		//	73,649	
Value		\$50			\$242			\$3,876	
Total:									
Pounds	489, 983 \$21, 797	474,665 \$10,445		419,353 \$23,527	6,010	+ 413,343 + \$23,214	989, 365 \$53, 698	\$3,460 \$4,427	+ 905,003 + \$49,271
The state of the s	4-77-0	440,110	711,000	420,020		, ,,,,,,,,	400,000		710,27
Tobacco: Leaf, suitable for eigar wrappers—								1 1 2 2 2 2 2 3	
PoundsValue.		18,886 \$20,745			24,372 \$20,999			81,206 \$75,192	
Other leaf—	STATE OF THE PARTY								
Pounds		120,646 \$83,565			\$1,888 \$59,958			83,276 \$26,626	
Total leaf—			100000000000000000000000000000000000000			CHICAGO.			
Pounds Value	16,307,480 \$2,709,030	139,532 \$104,310	+ 16,167,948 + \$2,604,720	17,688,562 \$2,953,817	106, 260 \$89, 957	+ 17,582,302 + \$2,872,860	16,156,268 \$2,658,563	164,482 \$101,818	+ 15,991,783 + \$2,556,745
		4101,010	, qu, uot, 120	42,303,317	404,007	7 44,014,000	40,000,000	4101,010	40,000,720
Stems and trimmings— Pounds	2,000	363,786			32,926				
Value. Cigars and cheroots—	\$60	\$4,540			\$315				
Thousands	138			90			41		
PoundsValue.	\$4,301	\$41		\$3,381	16 \$54		\$1,097	14 \$50	
Cigarettes— Thousands	1,462	411					100000000		
Pounds		67		1, 211	68 \$124		129	15	
Value	\$5,029	\$374		\$4,392	\$124	HORSE STREET	\$710	872	

Imports into United States from Canada and exports from United States to Canada, etc.—Continued.

	1	Fiscal year 1913			Fiscal year 191	4.		Fiscal year 191	5.
	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
Tobacco—Continued.	37.45.5	BIRT							actor days
Plug— Pounds Value Smoking—	. 171, 994 \$74, 892			162,002 \$70,491			129,006 \$54,810		
Smoking— Pounds Value	231, 213 \$117, 756			236, 492 \$131, 010			192, 832 \$108, 567	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	
All other, value	\$22, 291	\$2,159		\$16,330			\$11,472		
Total, value	\$2,933,359	\$111,424	+ \$2,821,935	\$3, 179, 421	\$83,758	+ \$3,095,663	\$2,835,219	\$104,638	+ \$2,730,58
Bushels	297, 881 \$163, 039	\$10 \$901	+ 297,071 + \$162,138	218, 323 \$245, 994		+ 217, 298 + \$244, 012	• 352,823 \$231,182	4, 013 \$3, 883	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
Pounds	8, 165, 877 \$167, 359	293, 466, 860 \$5, 646, 289	-285, 300, 983 - \$5, 478, 930	7,544,600 \$151,783	\$10,634,926	-542, 139, 570 -\$10, 483, 143	493, 919 \$11, 673	658, 627, 818 \$12, 742, 743	- 658, 133, 89 - \$12, 731, 07
CordsValue		1,036,890 \$6,954,939			1,073,023 \$7,245,466			985,686 \$6,572,839	
Wood pulp: Tons Value	9,083 \$309,846	207, 088 \$4, 973, 061	- 198,005 - \$4,663,215	3, 195 \$103, 466	234, 041 \$5, 908, 517	- 230, 846 - \$5, 805, 051	2,727 . \$107,368	294, 935 \$7, 583, 081	- 292, 20 - \$7, 475, 71
American Company (Figure		Fiscal year 1916			Fiscal year 191	7.		Fiscal year 191	8.
	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
Wheat: Bushels Value	6, 244, 732 \$7, 430, 824	5, 673, 083 \$5, 766, 227	+ 571,649	4,714,836 \$9,856,529	23,715,293 \$41,374,943	- 19,000,457	252,540	24,690,105	- 24, 437, 56
Wheat flour: Barrels	50, 424 \$254, 717	329,577 \$1,686,417	- 279,153	77, 115 \$580, 326	The state of the s	- 97,311	\$577,965 83,334	\$51,820,536 455,175	- 371,841
Value Rye: Bushels	139,711			1.129.469			\$884,042 5,275	\$4,864,032	
Value	\$137,541 4,167			\$1,605,223 3,207			\$12,644 2,892		
Barrels. Value. Corn:	\$20,135			\$19,546 15,724,838			\$30,145		••••••
Bushels Value Cattle:	6,568,407 \$4,969,459	\$12,814		\$16, 158, 665	\$12,381	+ 15,715,712	7, 895, 892 \$13, 127, 564	\$18,415	+ 7,889,68
Number	4, 511 \$162, 515	\$10, 850, 214	- 233, 514	6, 382 \$462, 728	189, 285 \$8, 498, 113	- 182, 903	7, 286 \$638, 304	\$14, 377, 487	- 177, 800
BushelsValue	100 \$288	3, 094, 735 \$5, 135, 164	- 3, 094, 635	\$1,318	7, 014, 573 \$17, 334, 606	- 7,014,229	5, 836 \$31, 300	5, 501, 391 \$16, 375, 622	- 5, 495, 550
Eggs: DozensValue	7, 916, 534 \$1, 728, 760	225, 708 \$47, 047	+ 7,690,826	10, 850, 678 \$3, 305, 017	441, 151 \$145, 023	+ 10, 409, 527	5, 216, 179 \$1, 937, 493	778, 200 \$295, 889	+ 4, 437, 979
Wool: Pounds Value	4, 344, 749 \$2, 233, 971	6, 486, 580 \$1, 991, 903	- 2, 141, 831	2, 138, 077 \$1, 225, 071	8, 897, 690 \$4, 075, 397	- 6,759,613	967, 666 \$890, 691	9, 996, 695 \$6, 516, 892	- 9, 029, 029
Potatoes: Bushels Value Meats:	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	27, 576 \$16, 370	+ 202,539	574, 190 \$610, 648		- 2, 270, 174	825, 482 \$903, 308	977, 733 \$1, 077, 148	- 152, 251
Fresh beef— Pounds Value	3, 192, 196 \$320, 030	9, 918, 326 \$1, 000, 230		17,771,159 \$2,171,951	9, 435, 742 \$1, 054, 852		37, 349, 521 \$5, 309, 684	20, 768, 167 \$3, 104, 367	
Fresh mutton— PoundsValue	2, 925, 052 \$366, 739	40, 979 \$7, 443		2, 449, 497 \$351, 293	118,330 \$25,942		1,783,382 \$381,668	496, 882 \$109, 073	
Fresh pork— Pounds. Value Bacon and hams—	32, 962, 200 \$3, 824, 831	2, 017, 060 \$218, 328		24, 832, 531 \$4, 944, 891	1,651,227 \$280,795		11, 395, 691 \$2, 792, 704	1,813,017 \$369,211	
PoundsValue	42, 264, 249	577, 396 \$87, 334		124, 326, 937 \$22, 388, 007	168, 056 \$39, 265		57, 123, 764 \$15, 531, 452	245, 692 \$75, 236	
Total meats, pounds	81, 343, 697	12, 553, 761	+ 68, 789, 936	169, 380, 124	11, 373, 355	+158, 006, 769	107, 652, 358	23, 313, 758	+ 84, 328, 60
Fruits, fresh and dried: Apples, dried— Bushels	1, 807, 499			1,340,607 \$84,683			854, 587 \$109, 327		
Value	\$101,673 301,986	is tried		314,955			457, 948 \$1, 721, 424	AND CATEFORE FOR	
Value	\$858, 912 1, 558, 407			\$948, 967 751, 012			1, 388, 275		
Value		CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY		\$86, 224	300000000000000000000000000000000000000		\$203,578	100 JOHN STORES	
Value	\$607,900			\$769,937	1,373 \$1,760		\$835,000	745 \$1,047	
Pounds		. 22, 489 \$1, 676			. 238, 400 \$36, 643		:::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::		
Pounds	The second second second	41 W. C. A. S. S. L. S. C. S.							
PoundsValue		3,000			32				
Grapes— Cubic feet Value		. \$52			3, 356			. 191 \$385	
Lemons, value	\$359, 786		l				\$633, 388		

Imports into United States from Canada and exports from United States to Canada, etc.—Continued.

		Fiscal year 1916	3.		Fiscal year 191	7.		Fiscal year 191	8.
countries and the second	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
Fruits, fresh and dried—Continued.									
Olives— Gallons		17,406			8,874			1,998	
Value Oranges—		\$8,993			\$5, 438		1 700 990	\$1,209	
Value	1,489,746 \$3,449,589	\$246		1,726,394 \$4,029,265	\$126		1,190,629 \$4,398,613	84	
Pounds	3,964,349 \$166,782			3,320,917 \$227,844			3,496,043 \$354,375		
Pears, green or ripe, value Prunes, dried—	\$241, 156			\$432, 180			\$654,674		
Pounds	11,857,965 \$660,410			11, 112, 227 \$816, 306			18,025,903 \$1,477,078		
Raisins— Pounds	25, 513, 920 \$1, 869, 083	2,305 \$177		30, 319, 658	120			550	
Value	\$1,069,083 \$1,784,845	\$177 \$154,132		30,319,658 \$2,373,667 \$2,226,362	\$132,371		37, 938, 552 \$3, 388, 162 \$3, 053, 793	\$167, 168	
Total, value	\$10,014,436	\$168,310	+ \$9,846,126	\$12, 493, 333	\$177,916	+\$12,315,417	\$16,829,412	\$225, 285	+ \$16,604,127
Cotton, unmanufactured: Sea Island—									
Pounds	938, 494			181, 820			665, 258		****
Value Upland and other—	\$246, 268			\$94,302			\$433, 232		
Pounds	96, 123, 702 \$11, 258, 852			\$2, 892, 880 \$14, 579, 584			101, 102, 381 \$27, 981, 097		
Linters— Pounds Value	1, 767, 403			10, 525, 756 \$1, 432, 818			23, 218, 787 \$2, 791, 374		
	\$175,341			91, 202, 010			94, 191, 514		
Total— Pounds Value	98, 829, 599 \$11, 680, 461	43, 041	+ 98, 786, 558 +\$11, 676, 164	93, 600, 456 \$16, 106, 704		+ 93,600,438 +\$16,106,701	124, 986, 426 \$31, 205, 703	5, 315 \$1, 815	+ 124, 981, 111 + \$31, 203, 888
Oil cake and oil cake meal:	44,400,000			110,110		1	349,449,44		1 301, 200, 000
Corn— Pounds	5,750			250, 904			250		
Value	\$92			\$4,449			\$10		
PoundsValue	82, 200 \$853			40, 765 \$714			1,382,700 \$32,369		
Cottonseed meal— Pounds	9, 835, 100			21, 688, 628			12, 195, 654		
ValueLinseed cake—	\$151,198			\$367,955			\$262,700		•••••
Pounds	1,325,840 \$23,035			6, 384, 269 \$125, 749			10, 493, 000 \$249, 103		
Linseed meal— Pounds							1, 253, 256 \$32, 998		
Value	The same and			007 077			- comments		
Pounds	179,053 \$3,029			905,257 \$20,025			493,347 \$11,292		
Total— Pounds	11,427,943	2,387,864	+ 9,040,079	29, 268, 923	2.068,946	+ 27,199,977 + \$485,752	25,818,207	2,805,640	+ 23,012,567
Value	\$178,207	\$32,147	+ \$146,060	\$518,892	\$33,140	+ \$485,752	\$588,472	\$67,926	+ \$520,546
Sugar: Beet—					the transfer				
PoundsValue		1,600 \$156			28,780 \$1,439			630 \$66	
Pounds		12;985			9,687			89,667	
Value		\$984			\$875			\$8,555	
Total— Pounds	642,253 \$54,237	14,585 \$1,140	+ 627,668 + 3 53,097	841,892 \$50,607	38,467 \$2,114	+ 803,425	11,936,008	90,297 \$8,621	+ 11,845,711 + \$684,677
Value Tebacco:	\$01,237	\$1,140	+ \$35,097	300,007	84,114	+ \$48,493	\$693,298	38,021	+ \$084,677
Leaf, wrapper— Pounds		23,496			70,091			58,629	
Value.		\$22,638			\$80,583			\$190,348	
				00000	**** ***		1	190,899	
Leaf, filler—Pounds		124,637			152,809	4	Carrie Control Control Control		
I.eaf, filler— Pounds Value Total leaf—		124,637 \$33,472			\$87,050			\$58,238	
I.caf, filler— Pounds Value Total leaf— Pounds		148,133	+ 18,473,053	15,272,422	\$87,050		17,577,987	279,528	+ 17,298,456 + \$6,047,620
I cef, filler— Pounds Value Total leaf— Pounds Value Stems and trimmings—		148,133			\$87,050	+ 15,049,522			+ 17,298,450 + \$6,047,622
I cef, filler— Pounds Value Total leaf— Pounds Value Stems and trimmings—	18,621,186 \$3,214,216	148,133	+ 18,473,053	15,272,422	\$87,050		17,577,987 \$6,296,212	279,528	
I cef, filler— Pounds Value. Total leaf— Pounds Value. Stems and trimmings— Pounds Value. Cigars and cheroots— Thousands	18, 621, 186 \$3, 214, 216	148,133 \$56,110	+ 18,473,053 + \$3,158,106	15,272,422 \$3,430,684	\$87,050 222,900 \$167,633	+ 15,049,522 + \$3,263,051	17,577,987 \$6,296,212	279,528 \$248,586	
I cef, filler— Pounds Value Total leaf— Pounds Value Stems and trimmings— Pounds Value Cigars and cheroots— Thousands Pounds Value Value Value Value	18, 021, 186 \$3, 214, 216	148,133 \$56,110	+ 18,473,053 + \$3,158,106	15,272,422 \$3,430,684 3,000 \$210	\$87,050	+ 15,049,522 + \$3,263,051	17,577,987 \$6,296,212	279,528 \$248,586	
I.cef, filler— Pounds. Value Total leaf— Pounds. Value Stems and trimmings— Pounds. Value Cigars and cheroots— Thousands. Pounds. Value Cigarettes— Thousands.	18, 021, 186 \$3, 214, 216	148,133 \$56,110	+ 18,473,053 + \$3,158,106	15, 272, 422 \$3, 430, 684 3,000 \$210	\$87,050 222,900 \$167,633 78 \$437	+ 15,049,522 + \$3,263,051	17,577,987 \$6,296,212	279,528 \$248,586	
I.eaf, filler— Pounds. Value. Total leaf— Pounds. Value. Stems and trimmings— Pounds. Value. Cigars and cheroots— Thousands. Pounds. Value. Cigarstes— Thousands. Pounds. Value. Cigarettes— Thousands. Pounds. Value. Value. Value. Value. Value. Value. Value. Value. Value.	18, 021, 186 \$3, 214, 216	148,133 \$56,110	+ 18,473,053 + \$3,158,106	15, 272, 422 \$3, 430, 684 3,000 \$210 \$2 \$2, 274	\$57,050 222,900 \$167,633	+ 15,049,522 + \$3,263,051	17,577,987 \$6,296,212 96 \$3,340	279,528 \$248,586	
I.eaf, filler— Pounds. Value. Total leaf— Pounds. Value. Stems and trimmings— Pounds. Value. Cigars and cheroots— Thousands. Pounds. Value Cigarettes— Thousands. Pounds. Value Plug— Pounds.	18, 021, 186 \$3, 214, 216 34 \$1, 267 350 \$1, 627 142, 978	148,133 \$56,110 289 \$297	+ 18,473,053 + \$3,158,106	15, 272, 422 \$3,430,684 3,000 \$210 \$2 \$2, 274 1, 815 \$6, 597	\$87,050 222,900 \$167,633 78 \$437	+ 15,049,522 + \$3,263,051	17, 577, 987 \$6, 296, 212 96 \$3, 340 28, 225 \$51, 242 332, 152	279,528 \$248,586	
I cef, filler— Pounds. Value Total leaf— Pounds. Value Stems and trimmings— Pounds. Value Cigars and cheroots— Thousands. Pounds. Value. Cigarettes— Thousands. Pounds. Value Pounds. Value	18, 021, 186 \$3, 214, 216 34 \$1, 267 350 \$1, 627 142, 978 \$57, 876	148,133 \$56,110 289 \$297	+ 18,473,053 + \$3,158,106	15, 272, 422 \$3,430,684 3,000 \$210 \$2 \$2, 274 1, 815 \$6, 597 115, 143 \$49, 395	\$87,050 222,900 \$167,633 78 \$437	+ 15,049,522 + \$3,263,051	17, 577, 987 \$6, 296, 212 96 \$3, 340 28, 225 \$51, 242 332, 152 \$128, 604	279,528 \$248,586	
I.eaf, filler— Pounds. Value. Total leaf— Pounds. Value. Stems and trimmings— Pounds. Value. Cigars and cheroots— Thousands. Pounds. Value Cigarettes— Thousands. Pounds. Value Plug— Pounds.	18, 021, 186 \$3, 214, 216 34 \$1, 267 350 \$1, 627 142, 978	148,133 \$56,110 289 \$297	+ 18,473,053 + \$3,158,106	15, 272, 422 \$3,430,684 3,000 \$210 \$2 \$2, 274 1, 815 \$6, 597	\$87,050 222,900 \$167,633 78 \$437	+ 15,049,522 + \$3,263,051	17, 577, 987 \$6, 296, 212 96 \$3, 340 28, 225 \$51, 242 332, 152	279,528 \$248,586	

Imports into United States from Canada and exports from United States to Canada, etc .- Continued.

A Company of the Comp	F	iscal year 1916		,	Fiscal year 191	1.	1	iscal year 1918	3.
	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
Onions: Bushels.	257, 632	4, 367	+ 253, 265	207, 852	56, 421	+ 151,431	184, 844	10, 800	+ 174,04
Value	\$235, 739	\$5,959	+ \$229,780	\$296, 258	\$126, 773	+ \$169,485	\$190, 193	\$14, 364	+ \$175, 829
Newsprint paper: Pounds	1, 253, 244 \$34, 983	876, 423, 616 \$16, 646, 891	-875, 170, 372 -\$16, 611, 908	1, 245, 719 \$53, 587	981, 039, 992 \$23, 502, 671	-979, 794, 273 -\$23, 449, 084	453, 611 \$27, 244	1, 142, 977, 997 \$32, 416, 444	-1,142,524,386 - \$32,389,200
Cords		979,010			1, 016, 814			1,172,024	
Value		\$6, 373, 749		110000000000000000000000000000000000000	AMAILEC ALE KALA			\$11,088,358	
Value	11, 503 \$430, 563	353, 124 \$10, 432, 488	- 341, 621 \$10, 001, 925	11, 965 \$713, 956	\$22, 172, 343	- 431, 168 -\$21, 458, 387	6, 482 \$392, 225	\$25, 989, 607	- \$25, 597, 385
	6 months,	July to Decen	nber, 1918.	Ca	alendar year 19	119.	11 mont	ns ending Nov	. 30, 1920.
	Exports.	Imports.	Trade balance	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
Wheat: Bushels	26, 478, 814		+ 25,517,744	1,421,613	5,315,275	- 3,923,662.	14,800,945	23,771,699	→ 8,970,75
Value	\$61,430,715	\$1,962,245		\$3,314,818	50 T. 1 TEX. 10 TAX	CONTRACTOR AND ADDRESS OF THE ADDRES	\$41, 262, 739		
BarrelsValue	30,666 \$308,266	24,651 \$252,156	+ 6,015	7,316 \$80,154	13,380 \$137,647	- 6,064	24,189 \$268,749	\$6,305,681	- 539,887
Rye: Bushels Value	120, 583 \$202, 121		+ 120,583	1,385,498 \$2,063,613			6,384,692 \$13,226,669		+ 6,381,693
Rye flour: Barrels	45,010 \$456,170		+. 45,010	8,025 \$61,111			3,228 \$37,674		+ 3,22
Value	6,847,733		+ 6,817,621	6,512,025		+ 6,515,909	9,033,293		+ 9,023,950
Value	\$9,320,736	\$492	, 0,021,022	\$10,690,552	\$40,766	1 0,020,000	\$13,653,365	\$30,338	7 0,023,00
NumberValue	1, 805 \$172, 910	218, 797 \$20, 531, 705	- 216, 992	11, 192 \$859, 621	550, 001 \$59, 276, 051		4,060 \$541,182	272,670 \$21,049,764	
Flaxseed: BushelsValue		510, 410 \$1, 894, 757	- 502, 419	8, 562 \$65, 975	The state of the state of	- 1,270,570	10, 255 \$77, 008	1, 189, 479 \$4, 229, 305	- 1,179,22
Eggs: Do ens Value	1, 173, 664 \$498, 503	27,610 \$13,747	+ 1,146,051	9, 243, 677 \$4, 317, 323	325, 846 \$122, 618	+ 8,917,831	7, 025, 255 \$3, 302, 927	179, 490 \$112, 162	+ 6,845,76
Wool: Pounds Value	194, 107	2, 452, 781	- 2, 258, 674	2, 493, 176	12, 815, 891	- 10, 317, 715	5,077,056	4, 734, 429	+ 342,62
Potatoes:	The street of the	\$1,558,785	400 000	\$1,889,608	\$8, 389, 598		\$2,843,266	\$2, 139, 218	Lasang.
Bushels Value	383, 330 \$464, 652	809, 963 \$805, 457	- 426,633	610, 622 \$885, 550		- 4,697,102	733, 626 \$1, 597, 391	4, 881, 541 \$10, 420, 104	- 4,147,91
Fresh beef— Pounds Value Fresh mutton—		11,530,817 \$1,966,685	- 10,022,487	2,621,011 \$481,298	31, 124, 474 \$5, 416, 764		2,304,571 \$389,104	35, 514, 797 \$6,000, 792	- 33,210,22
PoundsValue	647, 887 \$153, 134	586, 536 \$128, 523	+ 61,351	2,594,402 \$529,050	6,791,939 \$1,392,389			8,253,212 \$2,034,359	- 6,667,42
Fresh pork— Pounds.	81, 491	1,422,661	desous	21,905,577	2,407,601	100	10,641,961	949, 528	+ 9,692,43
Value Bacon and hams—	\$12,764	\$335,128		\$6,897,596	\$525,060		\$2,452,500	\$288,762	
PoundsValue	7,385,747 \$2,287,122	1,736,562 \$506,494	+ 5,649,185	41,710,504 \$12,959,005	2,527,969 \$755,827		17, 904, 839 \$4, 302, 866	638,738 \$202,005	
Total meats, pounds		15, 276, 576	- 5,653,521	68, 831, 494	103346.03	+ 25,979,511	32, 437, 154	45, 356, 275	E CANCELLO COM
Fruits, fresh and dried:									
Apples, dried— Bushels—	50,809			69,740					
Value	4.815			1	THE RESIDENCE		. \$30,849		
Pounds	223,605 \$1,013,293			\$1,121,728			262, 431 \$1, 458, 240		
Pounds	1, 158, 928			724, 844			769, 193		
Value Bananas—	510 9771								
BunchesValue		341 \$433			523 \$680			. \$666	
Berries, value	20000000	78, 400		\$1,151,897	300, 951		\$750,053	120, 198	Section (Section)
Pounds		\$18, 158			\$55,690				
PoundsValue					. 678 \$195				
Figs— Pounds	a service de la companya de la comp	Secondonnan	Section Section 1999			1571.0370.05		1	SHOP CONTROL OF RESIDEN
ValueGrapes—					\$9			\$10, 912	
Cubic feet		\$259			22, 388 \$35, 600			206, 638 \$456, 407	
Lemons, value	. \$565, 123	9203			400,000			\$2, 172	
GallonsValue.									
Oranges— Boxes.	307, 458						1, 211, 813		
Value Peaches, dried— Pounds									
Value	\$35, 808								

Imports into United States from Canada and exports from United States to Canada, etc.—Continued

	6 months	, July to Dece	mber, 1918.	C	alendar year 1	1919.	11 mon	ths ending No	7. 30, 1920.
	Exports.	Imports.	Trade balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
Fruits, fresh and dried—Continued. Prunes, dried— Pounds. Value	3, 200, 914 \$271, 766			14, 519, 219 \$1, 877, 292			13, 902, 863 \$1, 997, 914		
Raisins— Pounds Value	12, 987, 069 \$1, 171, 346			39, 195, 368 \$4, 751, 287	3, 982		26, 531, 775 \$4, 890, 294 \$3, 539, 092	34, 491 \$6, 367 \$808, 400	
All other except preserves, value Total, value	\$2, 193, 602 \$8, 089, 628	\$148, 464 \$167, 314	+ \$7,922,314	\$4, 456, 141 \$23, 291, 938	\$1, 135, 255 \$1, 229, 491		\$3, 539, 092 \$21, 065, 619		+ \$19,744,3
Cotton, unmanufactured:	a his is	20.0		is special tra					1 420,111,0
Sea Island— Pounds Value	322,389 \$223,144			1,860,079 \$1,107,706			556, 377 \$409, 935		
Upland and other— Pounds Value	50, 353, 229 \$15, 630, 615			78, 428, 852 \$25, 065, 365			92,536,169 \$33,818,010		
Linters— Pounds Value	10,595,154 \$1,297,050			3,116,794 \$201,899			7, 362, 385 - \$408, 365		
Total— Pounds Value	61,270,772 \$17,150,809		+ 61,270,772 +\$17,150,809	83, 405, 725 \$26, 374, 970	83 \$22	+ 83, 405, 642 +\$26, 374, 948	100, 454, 931 \$34, 636, 310	26,000 \$8,296	+ 100,423,9 + \$34,623,0
Oil cake and oil cake meal:				320,013,010		1.00,01,010	401,000,010	0,20	1 402,023,0
Corn— Pounds Value	60,000 \$2,606			62, 250 \$2, 238			90, 820 \$2, 216		
Cottonseed cake— Pounds Value				651, 119 \$20, 383			120,000 \$4,230		
Cottonseed meal— Pounds Value	5,325,100 \$139,309			8,758,085 \$272,398			6,602,531 \$187,432		0.57
Linseed cake— Pounds	1,215,560 \$31,664			405,518 \$14,088			120,000 \$3,831		
Linseed meal— Pounds Value	17, 801, 600 \$482, 265			4,491,826 \$131,904			3,132,125 \$94,062		
All other— Pounds Value	815,904 \$10,960			904,109 \$17,489			1,309,936 \$28,401		
Total— Pounds Value	25, 218, 164 \$666, 804	338, 280 \$7, 355	+ 24, 879, 884 + \$659, 449	15, 272, 907 \$458, 500	1, 151, 980 \$27, 538	+ 14, 120, 927 + \$430, 962	11, 375, 412 \$320, 172	2, 079, 018 \$66, 983	+ 9, 293, 36 + \$253, 18
Sugar: Beet—		100011111111111111111111111111111111111	- 5						
PoundsValueCane	197				4 001 000			812, 100 \$92, 049	
PoundsValue		14, 169 \$1, 334			4, 961, 368 \$508, 808			58, 497, 675 \$10, 336, 422	·····
Total— Pounds Value	59, 255, 324 \$3, 331, 010	14, 169 \$1, 334	+ 59, 241, 155 + \$3, 329, 676	552, 156 \$108, 811	4, 961, 368 \$508, 808	- 4,409,212 - \$399,997	5, 376, 131 \$715, 821	59, 309, 775 \$10, 428, 471	- 53, 933, 64 - \$9, 712, 65
Tobacco: Leaf, wrapper— Pounds.		2,334			375, 454	100000		17, 230	2 2 11 1 10 2 = 11 1
ValueLeaf, filler— Pounds		\$6,005			\$435, 431			\$33, 591 61, 865	
Value		11, 366 \$6, 855			147, 023 \$64, 754			\$23, 935	
. Total leaf— Pounds Value	15, 349, 985 \$6, 011, 507		+ 15, 336, 285 + \$5, 998, 647	19, 850, 798 \$9, 335, 843	522, 477 \$500, 188	+ 19, 328, 321 + \$8, 835, 655	15, 131, 076 \$9, 014, 576	79, 095 \$57, 528	+ 15,051,98 + \$8,957,05
Stems and trimmings— Pounds				4, 905		04 115 115	4, 263		
Value	54			\$152 116			\$135 37		
Pounds	\$1,824	••••••		\$1,973	\$362		\$1,041	374 \$388	
Thousands	11, 815 \$21, 694			9, 148 \$21, 499	159 \$826		23, 504 \$56, 417	142 \$898	······································
Plug— Pounds Value	55, 309 \$36, 091			73, 671 \$60, 505			78, 145 \$61, 439		
Smoking— Pounds Value.	158, 829 \$121, 751			332, 452 \$295, 108			244, 235 \$231, 234		
All other, value	\$4,646	\$610 \$13,470	+ \$6, 184, 043	\$8, 136 \$9, 723, 216	\$1,859 \$503,235	+ \$9,219,981	\$12,012 \$9,376,854	\$7,066 \$65,878	+ \$9,310,97
onions:	99, 316 \$126, 419	6,801	+ 92,515	218, 129	26, 328 \$29, 725	+ 191,801	258,506 \$465,826	8,600 \$7,389	+ 249,90 + \$458,43
Value	85, 303	\$6,896 566,203,055	\$119,523 -566,117,752	\$467, 220 703, 243	1, 248, 957, 881	+ \$437,495 -1,248,254,638 -\$43,445,380	1,732,251 \$133,461	1, 240, 915, 658 \$56, 963, 745	-1,239,183,40 - \$56, 830, 28
Pulp wood: Cords	\$6,151	796, 650	-\$17,083,758	\$34,940	\$43,480,329 1,047,091 \$10,456,696	-\$43, 445, 380	₹100,401	1,070,330	4 00, 000, 48
Value Wood pulp:		\$7,916,140		***************************************	\$10,456,696		*************	\$14,301,697	- 540, 28 - \$56, 764, 30

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am a strong believer in political parties—in political organizations—for the reason that I believe no measure of any importance can be presented before the American people and no policy can be adopted by the American people unless there is some party behind the policy-some party that is capable of presenting the issues to the American

But while I believe in party ties, I am not blind to some of the evils which flow from those ties. I have seen the manifestation of that evil not only when the Republican Party was in the minority but to a greater degree now that the Democratic Party is in the minority. A great many Senators seem to think that the moment their party becomes a minority party their highest duty to their consciences and their States is to find some kind of a pitfall into which they can dump the other party, and therefore they struggle and strive day after day, holding up legislation in some wild attempt to see if they can not find some flaw in the position taken by Senators on the other side of the Chamber.

I may claim that I am, perhaps, as little inclined to be a blind party follower as any man in the Senate; and the fact that I am not inclined to always follow does not detract, in my opinion, at least, from my good, sound, Republican principles. I claim to be a protectionist, and I follow that rule in voting upon tariff legislation. I do not think that everything which emanates from the Democratic side of the Chamber is necessarily wicked and vicious and hellish, as some of my friends on the other side think of everything which emanates from this side of the Chamber. I find that political parties are made up from the people of the United States, and that the people either inherit their political beliefs, as they often inherit their religious beliefs, or are affected by their early environment. I believe that, as a rule, people try to be reasonably honest with themselves, and that there are few questions presented for argument in this Chamber which have not their two sides and can not be defended upon either side to a certain extent.

Therefore I regret-and I may say that I exceedingly regretwhen I see Senators with such transcendent ability as many of those on the other side of the Chamber possess spending most of their time in finding fault with the Republican Party and condemning it rather than discussing fairly and, I think, honestly, the real merits of any proposition before the Senate.

I am not claiming that if we pass the pending bill we are going to raise wheat immediately 25 cents a bushel or 35 cents a bushel. I do not claim for a single moment that grain, like any other article, is not affected by the world's supply and demand. There are many conditions which affect it. But I must claim that I know a little more about the trade between this country and Canada than the informant who furnished the material which was the subject matter just discussed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

The Senator from Kentucky says the prices of grain in this country must be governed by the surplus of both this country To a certain extent that is true. Then he backs up his proposition by a statement that we exported to Canada some 50,000,000 bushels of grain and Canada exported to the United States 48,000,000 bushels of grain, or some such amount, in a given length of time. I may not give his figures correctly, as I did not understand him exactly, but they are sufficiently accurate for this discussion:

The Senator perhaps did not quite understand all the conditions involved in the export of grain from the two countries. We do not export one bushel of wheat to be consumed in Canada, so' that eliminates 50,000,000 bushels. We may through the Welland Canal, for export, 50,000,000 bushels, which comes through Chicago, and from the Southern and Central States. We export practically none of the spring wheat which is raised in the Northwest, except in the form of macaroni. But the millions of bushels which come from Canada into this country; about which we are complaining, is the wheat we grind into flour and sell to the people of the United States. In other words, it comes into competition with the product grown in the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Curus in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah? Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator ought to state that we export to Canada millions of dollars worth of cereals in various forms during the year.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; we do export some millions, I think, most of it perhaps canned, like canned corn, and such articles, and a great many things which, by reason of our superior milling facilities, we are able to export.

Mr. KING. Breakfast foods of various kinds.

Mr. McCUMBER. And other different articles of food. I am not questioning that. I will hold close to the discussion of wheat for a while, however, until I get through with that.

The Senator from Kentucky states that it must follow if there is a surplus in the United States and a surplus in Canada, the price of our grain will be governed by the surplus in Canada; If we had to send all our surplus of a certain kind of grain to a foreign country, that would be true. But it so happens that it is not true.

The Senator from Kentucky has theoretical ideas about this situation, but the wheat buyer up in Minneapolis has practical ideas, and he puts his ideas into effect. When he looks across the border and sees from thirty-five to forty-five million bushels of wheat on the other side of the lake which will come over here the moment he bids up a little higher for the American wheat, he is not going to bid up any higher for it. He is going to get his wheat just as cheaply as he can.

The Senator seems to be surprised that the Canadian wheat brings just as good a price as the American wheat. Why, of course, that is what we are complaining about. protection, however, to keep it out of the country, it would not, Naturally, water will seek its level, and if the prices should be a little lower on the Canadian side for a single week it would begin to flow over to this side, and the fact that it can flow over to this side means that it will keep our prices down as low as the Canadian prices, and that will always be the case just as long as we have no tariff wall between the two countries. I hope the Senator will understand that practical propo-

I wish to invite the attention of the Senator now to another matter that I do not think he has fully considered. Under normal conditions, when we know just what the world's supply is for several months ahead, if I sell May wheat as against December wheat, I will always sell May wheat at an advantage. What will measure the advantage? It will be the difference between the carrying cost from December until May. That is the higher. That is, when we are protected.

But now let us see. If you will look at the grain statistics for the last month you will find that May wheat has been selling from 18 to 28 cents below cash wheat. There is a reason for that, a real practical reason, and the farmer up in my State understands that practical reason and of course the wheat buyer understands what it is. What is it? There are 45,000,000 bushels of wheat over at Fort William and Port Arthur all ready to be shipped when navigation opens. Navigation generally opens in May. In ordinary years there may be half a million to a million bushels there, but now there are from 35,000,000 to 40,000,000 bushels there realy for shipment to the United States the moment navigation opens. That will add so much to our surplus, and if we have a given amount of surplus of course it depresses the price, but if we multiply the surplus three times over our price is depressed to a still greater extent. The wheat buyer understands that, the miller understands it, and whea he is buying for his mill for several months ahead he is looking over the country to see whether the visible supply is where he can get hold of it at a moment's notice. If he finds in his own country in the section from which he draws, say Minneapolis, from the spring-wheat section, that there is not a visible supply and that means a supply in the elevators from which he can draw, he will begin to bid up on his price to bring in the grain.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President— Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment and I will yield. If that supply can come over from Canada and he sees that there is a supply that he can reach into, he does not have to bid up at all. He can get that wheat for the same price and just bring it across the lake, and it will not cost him any more than to bring it from any other section as near by.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky. Mr. STANLEY. As I understand the Senator, his argument is as to the price of wheat adjacent to the market, which means adjacent to the Minneapolis mills, to which this wheat is consigned, and not the level of prices over the country generally?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes. Mr. STANLEY. The contention is that it affects wheat in

that immediate locality but not over the country generally?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; only as the price in one section of
the country immediately reflects itself all over the country. It may not to any great extent, but it actually does. At one time we had 25 cents a bushel tariff on Canadian grain. We were exporting during all the years that we had that tariff. I am dealing with facts and not theories. Our prices averaged during that time at Minneapolis, which were the same at Duluth and on the Lakes, nearly 10 cents a bushel more than on the

Canadian side. Sometimes they would be almost the same. There were times when even the Canadian wheat might be a cent or two higher, but taking the average throughout all those years, the prices as quoted day in and day out were always higher upon the American side, and when we were short in our spring wheat in 1909 and 1910, Minneapolis and Liverpool prices were practically the same during most of the summer. It showed that in that year we had some 18 or 20 cents above the prices on the Canadian side. They had plenty of wheat on the Canadian side to ship in and of the same kind that the Minneapolis miller uses. We did not have 25 cents a bushel advantage, but it did help us out; it gave us an average of about 10 cents when wheat was selling from 90 cents to a dollar a bushel.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator speaks of the difference. differs widely from the conclusion reached by the Tariff Commission touching the difference in prices and costs. Does the Senator mean to contend that the difference in price was due to any other cause than the difference in the value of American money and Canadian money?

McCUMBER. Oh, no; this was before the war, and Canadian money was at par then. I am speaking now entirely of the period before the war, because that is the time when we had our tariff of 25 cents a bushel.

Mr. STANLEY. Taking it before the war, were the differences between the prices in Minneapolis and Winnipeg any greater than the difference between St. Louis or Kansas City and Minneapolis, or Charleston, S. C., and Minneapolis?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; there was a greater difference,

and I will tell the Senator why.

Mr. STANLEY. I think in that respect the Senator differs again from the findings of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. McCUMBER. I say it was reflected, but the difference

would be greater, I think, during that period.

Mr. STANLEY. I will place in the Record at a later date the statement of the Tariff Commission, in which they differ radically from the findings of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Tariff Commission can not differ from the actual figures as shown from the daily reports which I gave some time ago. I have not them with me now. I went over a period of 10 years and took the Winnipeg prices, made a very little allowance for the difference between the higher standard of grain which they really required for their No. 1 northern and our No. 1 northern, and compared the two for, I think, the 10 years that I took at that time, and they averaged a little less than 10 cents difference.

Mr. STANLEY. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if it is not true that No. 1 Winnipeg Canadian wheat brings a higher price in Liverpool than American wheat of the

same alleged quality?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; a very little higher, because they require a little stricter grade of any kind of mixed wheat. I think when wheat was \$1 a bushel the difference as I computed it at that time would make from 2 to 3 cents better for the Canadian than for the American on that basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understood the Senator a moment ago, he said that whereas there was a surplus of about one and onehalf million bushels of Canadian wheat, there is now a surplus of about 50,000,000 bushels?

Between 35,000,000 and 40,000,000. In Mr. McCUMBER. elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur there were on the 1st of April between 35,000,000 and 40,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let us say about 40,000,000, whatever it may be. I wish to ask the Senator—and I am asking for information-why it was that this immense increase in the amount of surplus of Canadian wheat had taken place? Was it owing to an immensely increased Canadian crop or to an immensely decreased world consumption?

Mr. McCUMBER. I suppose undoubtedly that we can credit it to some extent to both. There was not a greatly increased Canadian crop, but there was a very good crop throughout Canada and a rather short crop in the spring wheat States in the United States. Canada produced the same kind of grain, and therefore there was a big demand by millers in this country for what they called the spring No. 1 northern wheat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand it, the increase of the Canadian crop over the normal Canadian crop in no way accounted for the difference between 1,500,000 and 40,000,000

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no; certainly not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then do I understand that the immense accretion of Canadian surplus must be due largely to the decrease in world consumption?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think it may be due to a decreased world consumption and a decrease of foreign demand because of the inability of many countries to buy as much wheat as they could use

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that.

Mr. McCUMBER. And therefore affording a better market

in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When I said world consumption, of course, was speaking in terms of economics. The world consumption of a product is the amount of the product that the world can afford to take and pay for, so that the world consumption is effectually the world demand. Now, has not that same thing happened with regard to cotton and with regard to nearly everything else which we raise in the shape of raw material. and can we hope to cure a world condition like that by mere American legislation?

Mr. McCUMBER. It often happens when you can not make sick man well that you can at least keep him from dying. You may prescribe something that will prevent his demise en-I do not think anything that we can do in the shape of legislation to-day will make farming profitable in the United States at present wages and considering what the farmer has to pay for other things which he purchases, but it will make his losses less, and, therefore, I desire to do what I can for that reason.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I submit this thought to my friend from North Dakota: You can not keep a sick man from dying if he is dying for lack of food unless you give him food, and unless you are an altruist or philanthropist the world can not give him food unless he can pay for food either in money or in credit. So that you can not increase the foreign demand for American and Canadian wheat by American legislation which merely affects a little competition between America and Canada, nor by Canadian legislation which would merely affect the same thing. I add that because, of course, Canada will retaliate. Canada would be an immense ass if she did not retaliate if we start upon this economic warfare; but in either event the little settlement of our quantum of supplies for the competitive market could not enable the foreigner to buy the wheat or the flour unless we could reduce the price to him. Then, of course, pro tanto he could buy more; but when we increase our tariff between one another it is for the express purpose of increasing the price in the home market. If that has any effect in the foreign markets at all, the increase will be reflected there.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, no legislation, perhaps, that we can pass is going to affect the price that Canada can receive for her grain in a foreign market; I will admit that; but legislation which we can pass which will give to the American farmer exclusively, as against the Canadian farmer or any other farmer, his home market will pro tanto assist the American farmer. That is all we are claiming for the proposed legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One more question, and then I will prom-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield in a moment. the broad proposition that the American market belongs of right to the American farmer just so long as he can supply that market for a reasonable compensation for his labors. We are not asking anything further. We can not go any further than that, but we can go that far.

WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one more question, then I will resist the temptation further to bore my friend with questions.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Mississippi never borcs anybody.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The United States is now raising a surplus of wheat over and above the domestic demand for it, is

Mr. McCUMBER. On the whole, I answer the Senator's question yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course we have got to take ourselves as a whole; we are a Nation now. We are raising more wheat than we are consuming; and if the Senator admits that our local legislation can not increase the foreign price for wheat, then we have already overloaded the home supply of wheat, which can not be affected by merely cutting off foreign competition for the home market, where we already have an oversupply.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have answered that, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's parden. I shall not ask him to answer it again,

Mr. McCUMBER. I have answered by saying that our spring wheat States-and they constitute the section of the country principally affected-have not a surplus; in fact, there is somewhat of a deficit. If Canada did not supply what amounts to a surplus, then we would have a very much better price for the grain that is raised in the spring wheat States, and that condition, while it would not entirely remedy the situation in Kansas and Nebraska, would be reflected to a certain extent in higher prices throughout the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At the risk of seeming to violate my promise of a moment ago, I desire to say that the different grades of wheat which are converted into various grades of flour are substitutable for one another as breadstuffs, as I

Mr. McCUMBER. They are not wholly so.
Mr. WILLIAMS. If that be the case, then we must consider the entire American demand for flour and the entire American supply of flour-edible flour, substitutable flour, one for the other. If we have more material out of which to make bread than the American people can eat or buy, then there is still a surplus in the market of all grades of wheat.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator were in my State he would soon find that the good housewife would never dream of using winter wheat flour. She knows nothing about it; she does not think it makes good bread; at least in her way of making it, it does not. It is not the bread that she is used to making; and she will buy nothing but "Pillsbury's best," or some one of those flours that are made from the wheat grown in the spring wheat States, which are very rich in gluten. Perhaps if I were to go into Kansas I should find that there they would not use that flour to any extent whatever, even although it is used to quite an extent in Washington, I notice by the advertisements, and the fact that every grocery store carries it. However, so long as there is less of the spring wheat raised in the United States than our mills can grind and find a market for, our prices will naturally go up unless we can reach right over across the line and open another spout and run in the Canadian grain of like quality.

I want to be perfectly fair in the discussion of this matter; I am not claiming everything for this legislation; but I know that it will do that much good, and I know that Canada has this granary right across the Lake, and sends us May wheat, which ought to be higher than cash wheat—for from 18 to 28 cents a bushel less than cash wheat. That is due entirely, as shown by the daily reports, in anticipation of the opening up of the Lakes for the transfer of Canadian grain to this country for consumption.

Mr. STANLEY rose.

Mr. McCUMBER. Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, and then I should like to pursue this matter to a conclusion.

Mr. STANLEY. As I understand, the Senator contends that generally prices for wheat are higher in the United States than in Canada?

Mr. McCUMBER. Under what conditions?
Mr. STANLEY. Under normal conditions.
Mr. McCUMBER. No; I do not claim that at all. Under the abnormal condition of having a tariff wall the Senator's statement is correct; under the normal condition of having no tariff wall naturally the prices of grains reach a common level, and they are no higher on one side of the line than on the other, because if they get higher on the one side than on the other, with no barrier at all, they immediately flow from one side to the other. I am not claiming that under normal conditions the prices are any higher here than in Canada.

Mr. STANLEY. I understood the Senator to say Mr. McCUMBER. What I am complaining is tha

What I am complaining is that if we put up a barrier, a wall high enough to keep out Canadian grain, we are going to have our prices at least considerably higher

whenever there is a little shortage.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to state just a moment ago that the prices for wheat just before

the war were higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg.

Mr. McCUMBER. During the war the prices might have been higher for some little local reason in connection with the supply and demand, but there is no general range of prices higher on one side than on the other whenever grain can flow from one side of the line to the other. That naturally follows. The prices were higher when we had a tariff than when the tariff was taken off, when the two flowed together and the price was practically the same on both sides, making the ordinary allowance for a little speculation in Winnipeg at one time and a different speculation in Chicago or Minneapelis, which might

send the price up or depress it, depending upon whether the bears or the bulls were at work.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to complete my remarks. The rates fixed by the agricultural schedule of the pending bill, it will be membered, will continue for six months only. Of course I want to continue them indefinitely, and hope to be able to do so in the next tariff bill. We expect to have a general tariff bill before the end of six months, and the rates provided in the pending bill will continue until that time. It is intended merely that they shall remain in effect until we can perfect a general tariff bill.

The pending measure provides for rates of duty on the articles enumerated according to the table duties which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is

granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The matter referred to is as follows:

Wheat, 35 cents per bushel.
Wheat flour and semolina, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Flaxseed, 30 cents per bushel.
Corn or maize, 15 cents per bushel.
Beans, 2 cents per pound.
Pennuts or ground beans, 3 cents per pound.
Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel.
Onions, 40 cents per bushel.
Rice, cleaned, 2 cents per pound; rice, cleaned for use in manufacture of canned foods, 1 cent per pound; uncleaned rice, 12 cents per pound; rice flour, meal, etc., 1 cent per pound; rice paddy, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.
Lemons, 2 cents per pound.
Oils: Peanut, 26 cents per gallon; cottonseed, coconut, and soya bean, 20 cents per gallon; olive, 40 cents per gallon in bulk, 50 cents per gallon in containers of less than 5 gallons.
Cattle, 30 per cent ad valorem.
Sheep: One year old or over, \$2 per head; less than 1 year old, \$1 per head.

Sheep. One year of the real sheep and other stock imported for breeding purposes, Cattle and sheep and other stock imported for breeding purposes,

Cattle and sheep and other stock imported for breeding purposes, free.

Cotton, with staple of 1½ inches or more, 7 cents per pound.

Wool, unwashed, 15 cents per pound; washed, 30 cents per pound; scoured, 45 cents per pound.

Wool, advanced beyond washed or scoured condition, 45 cents per pound in addition to rates of duty imposed by existing law.

Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by polariscope not above 75°, 1.16 cents per pound; each additional degree by polariscope, four one-hundredths of a cent per pound additional; molasses not above 40°, 24 per cent ad valorem; molasses above 40° and not above 56°, 3½ cents per gallon; above 56°, 7 cents per gallon.

Butter, and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound.

Cheese, and substitutes, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Milk, fresh, 2 cents per gallon; cream, 5 cents per gallon.

Milk, preserved, condensed, sterilized, 2 cents per pound; sugar of milk, 5 cents per pound.

Tobacco, wrapper and filler, \$2.35 per pound; if stemmed, \$3 per pound; filler, unstemmed, not specially provided for, 35 cents per pound; fi stemmed, 50 cents per pound.

Apples, 30 cents per bushel.

Cherries, 3 cents per pound.

Cherries, 3 cents per pound.

Olives, in solutions, 25 cents per gallon; not in solutions, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, while many articles of consumption in the United States have materially decreased in selling price, agricultural products, including those of cattle, sheep, and wool industries-I might mention cotton also-have decreased entirely out of proportion to the general decrease of commodities throughout the country. Bear that in mind. The decrease in the selling price of farm commodities rests upon an entirely different basis from the decrease in the case of other commodities. I wish Senators to consider that proposition for a moment. Most commodities in the United States had been held up for excessive prices so long that the people had become unable longer to purchase at those excessive prices. ceased buying, and in order to induce sales it became necessary to reduce the prices of such commodities. That is not true of agricultural products. There is just as much bread and butter and meat and poultry and eggs and vegetables consumed in the United States per capita to-day as there were when those products brought from two to three times the present prices. prices have not fallen because of a decrease in demand. A man can wear his shoes or suit a month or six months longer if he can not afford to pay the prevailing prices for these articles, but he can not let his stomach go empty for one day, no matter what the price of food may be. We must, therefore, look elsewhere to ascertain the cause of the tremendous slump in the price of agricultural products.

We will find, Mr. President, that the decrease is due entirely to an accumulating surplus of agricultural commodities in the United States, practically all brought about by enermously increased or inflated importations. There has never been a year for the last century in which we have not to some extent been exporting agricultural commodities. We have always had some surplus. The greater proportion of our products have always been consumed in this country. Our prices, therefore, have been fixed by the home demand, affected, of course, by the general world supply. The greater our surplus the smaller, naturally, our price. The visible supply—that is, the supply that is in the immediate reach of the miller—is the principal factor that governs the price which he offers for grain. If the supply is somewhat limited in this country, or in a certain vicinity, and we have something of a tariff wall between us and the great Canadian granary, the Minneapolis miller may be compelled to advance his price in order to keep his mill going. If he can tap this Canadian granary without any duty whatever, it will not be necessary for him to increase his bids.

The price of our wheat has been driven down to the lowest possible point because of enormous importations and imminent danger of still greater importations. The prices of our sheep and cattle have been driven down by reason of the enormous amount of shipments of mutton and beef and other meats. Our wool has been driven down because of the stupendous increase in

the importations of wool from foreign countries.

I will elucidate by a few figures on the wheat situation, without repeating anything I said in my previous argument on this

question.

As shown by the report of the Bureau of Markets, prior to 1914 the heaviest importations of wheat in any crop year were 2,673,000 bushels, and 150,000 barrels of flour, which, converted into wheat, makes about 60,000 bushels of wheat, and that would make somewhere about 3,000,000 bushels of importations for that year. That was the year ending June 30, 1914. general average for the several years just prior to 1914 was less than 1,000,000 bushels.

Now, turn to the year 1920. According to this same report, for the four months of September, October, November, and December there were imported for consumption in the United States from Canada 37,800,000 bushels of wheat-that is, for home consumption, not for export from the United States. In January and February the imports by rail to Minneapolis and

Duluth amounted to 6,800,000 bushels in addition.

On March 1, 1921, Canada had a net surplus of 45,000,000 bushels of wheat, about 35,000,000 of which were in store at Fort William and Port Ontario, in country elevators and cars in western Canada. With the opening of navigation these 35,000,000 bushels will be immediately loaded onto the United States. How much is coming in now I can not say, but I want to read from this same report a few items that may interest Senators who want to get at the real truth of the effect of Canadian importations.

I quote:

Wheat reserves in Canada will move slowly until about May 1, when, with the opening of navigation, it is predicted by the Chicago Board of Trade houses, there will be a heavy movement to the United

That accounts for the difference in May wheat. This is from official sources:

Speculators on the Chicago Board of Trade have begun to anticipate the heavy movement of Canadian wheat by selling the May future. The discount of the future under cash wheat indicates such selling pressure on the future and an absence of pressure on cash wheat.

Cash wheat, No. 2 red winter, in Chicago on March 19 sold at 22 to 23 cents over the May future, or at \$1.62 to \$1.65, and No. 2 hard winter at 11 to 15 cents over May, or \$1.53 to \$1.57. A year ago No. 2 hard winter sold at \$2.48 and two years ago at \$2.37.

This is from the Bureau of Markets:

In Minneapolis, on the 19th, No. 2 dark northern spring sold at 10 to 28 cents over Minneapolis May, or at \$1.47 to \$1.65. A year ago No. 2 dark northern sold at \$2.70 to \$2.95 and two years ago at \$2.44.

Now, I turn to a later report which I selected from the Jamestown Alert, a daily of my State, quoting the Minneapolis prices. This is April 27, just a few days ago:

MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN.

MINNBAPOLIS, April 27.

Flour unchanged. Shipments, 45,416 barrels. Bran, \$16. Wheat receipts, 314 cars, 101 cars a year ago. Cash No. 1 northern, \$1.30\(\frac{1}{2}\) to \$1.38\(\frac{1}{2}\); May, \$1.18\(\frac{1}{2}\)—

Making 20 cents difference-July, \$1.113.

And so on. The further you get ahead, the lower the price is, depending upon the anticipated shipments from Canada.

I remember when we were discussing the Taft reciprocity proposition in the Senate, and I would pick up the daily papers. One day it was thought that the reciprocity program would go through and wheat would go down from 6 to 10 cents a bushel. The next day it was reported that it would fail to go through, and wheat would go up from 6 to 10 cents a bushel in the Min-neapolis and the Duluth markets, all owing to the probability or improbability of free trade between the United States and Canada.

Mr. President, it is a waste of breath for any Senator to philosophize about the price in the United States being affected solely by the Liverpool price. The price is always affected by the principal place of consumption, and the United States consumes seven times as many bushels as are ever exported from the United States, and its home consumption is the main factor that fixes the price.

Of course, we are governed by the world supply and demand, and a great world supply reflects upon our price and depresses it, and a world deficit naturally affects it; but what affects it in addition to that, and what we are most concerned in, is the question of holding the American market for the American

farmer.

Now, Mr. President, I want to put into the RECORD a statement of the shipments of flaxseed into the United States.

I notice that Canada exported to the United States, between

1910 and 1914, 4,110,370 bushels of flaxseed. That was five years ago-less than a million bushels a year, about 800,000 bushels a year. In 1920 it was increased to 1,687,813 bushels. Now, I come to Argentina. Argentina exported to the United States for those four years a little less than 2,000,000 bushels. That would be less than half a million bushels for each year; but in 1921 she exported almost 23,000,000 bushels. Does anyone think that that does not have any effect upon the price of flax in the United States-more than twenty times as much as she had ever exported in any single year before? To protect the American market we are giving a higher protective duty.

I am not going over the wool schedule, nor the sugar schedule, nor the other schedules. They were fully discussed at the last session, and I do not think any further discussion is needed. All I want is that the Senate should clearly understand the real situation as it affects the American people at or near the

Canadian border.

As to meats, I quote the following from the Bureau of Mar-

There is a great surplus supply of meats and meat products in the United States, and prices of live stock have been driven to a decline much more rapid than the decline in cost of production while imports of meats have further depressed the market. This constitutes a meance to the live-stock industry. Live-stock operations (before the war frequently precarious and unprofitable) did not during the war build up a reserve of profits sufficient to offset the present losses due to the current marketing of war stimulated production at less than its cost. Chicago market live-stock prices in February, 1921, reached index figures ranging from 104 to 111 (based on 1913), while general commodities were 167, and manufactured articles 230. Allowing for increased freight to the market, farm prices of live stock are practically at or below prewar levels. The price drop has been so rapid that the value of animals in many cases is now less than the amount of loans secured by them, wiping out the grower's equity entirely.

With reference to butter, the Bureau of Markets has this to

With reference to butter, the Bureau of Markets has this to

Previous to 1919 our annual importation of butter varied from 1,000,000 pounds to 7,000,000 pounds, and in only one year, 1914, was it greater than 3,000,000 pounds. The exchange and credit situation stimulated imports, and we received from foreign countries over 9,000,000 pounds of butter in 1919, and in 1920 our imports reached the unprecedented figure of 37,000,000 pounds. In January, 1921, we imported 3,800,000 pounds and in February 1,896,000 pounds.

I do not care to discuss the assertion so often made that this is giving the farmer a gold brick. If it is giving it to him, we are not charging him a cent for it and it will not do him any harm; but the same Senators who are arguing that the farmer will not get any benefit from this legislation are with equally zealous and earnest argument declaring that it will raise the price of wheat 35 cents a bushel and that the consumer will pay I can not imagine anything more inconsistent. If the consumer will pay it, he can afford to pay it. If we should add 35 cents to the price of every bushel of wheat in the United States and it raised the price that much to the consumer, the consumer would pay 4 mills more for every loaf of bread that he ate, and as he eats half a loaf of bread a day upon the average for each person, it would cost him 2 mills more a day; and if he can make the farmer prosperous by paying 2 mills a day more for what he consumes, it is the best investment he can ever make, because it will enable the farmer to buy the products that the consumer is producing with labor that costs from \$5 to \$15 a day, while the farmers over the country to-day are not earning a dollar a day.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President. I am ready to yield

Mr. KING. I do not know that I am controverting the solicitude which the Senator has exhibited for the farmers. Indeed, I think the farmers probably have not been sufficiently compensated for the labors which they have performed in the development of our country. But if the argument which the Senator is making is sound, does not the Senator concede that it would be wise to increase the cost of everything which is produced, upon the theory that it would enable the vendor and the producer to buy more of other articles which are manufactured, so that as a result the more you pay for goods the greater your prosperity will be? Is not that the reductio ad absurdum to which the Senator's argument leads?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President. You may, by excessive labor costs, brought about from any cause that you see fit to assign, make two-thirds of the country live upon a plane whereby they can expend five times as much as the other third can possibly earn. That is the trouble we have to-day. city prices are so much in advance of the prices and the earnings in the rural districts that for everything which you purchase in the city, from your land, which costs \$100 a square foot, to the buildings which are constructed on it with bricks that cost a dollar apiece, they have to charge enormous prices, while they hope to recoup as against the farmer and compel him to produce for almost nothing. I want the farmer to earn as much as the carpenter. I ask the Senator if he does not?

Mr. KING. I would like to have him earn a little more. Mr. McCUMBER. I want the farmer to earn as much as the carpenter. I want him to have as good a wage as the bricklayer. I want his children to dress as well. I want them to have just as much money to spend at the movies and to take their families to the theater. I want them to be able to ride in a good auto and not in a flivver always, and to live the way the rest of the people live. What we want is to equalize the earning capacity of the American people, and the farmer's earnings are not a quarter of the earnings in any other possible line of business. By helping agriculture along in any way we can we are blessing the country at large.

RECESS.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to address the Senate to-day upon the pending bill, and I am informed that there is no one, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, May 9, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord God, we do not come unto Thee in fear and distress, but with a psalm of human thanksgiving, for Thy mercies are with us as the bread of life, and Thou dost give us hope and aspirations not born of time. Continue the bestowal of Thy blessings upon us, and may everyone have a place in Thy great heart, which is coextensive with the needs of man. God bless our homeland and preside over its life and destiny. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen,

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution (H. J. Res. 52) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to furnish water to applicants and entrymen in arrears for more than one calendar year of payment for maintenance or construction charges, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 13, 1914.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1084) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes, had agreed to conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. McCormick, Mr. Moses, and Mr. Underwood as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL PAGE.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration for the privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 77.

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint an additional page for the remainder of the present Congress, to be paid compensation out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of \$82.50 per month, said appointment to date from the opening of the present session.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution to provide a page to attend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL]. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

CLERK, COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF USELESS EXECUTIVE PAPERS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the consideration of another privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 75.

Resolved. That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of \$2,000 per annum for the services of one clerk for the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, said compensation to date from April 1, 1920.

The committee amendment was read, as follows: Strike out "April 1, 1920," and insert "April 11, 1921."

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House. the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and Documents has not half completed its work. It worked during the vacation, and wishes to continue and complete the work it now has in hand and dispose of these papers which are cluttering up the files of the departments. The clerk to the committee was paid during the vacation on an interregnum certificate from the committee. This is to continue the work that was authorized last session. I ask for the adoption of the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5010, the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5010, with Mr. Tilson in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5010, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5010) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Byrnes] was pending.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 9, after the word "all," strike out the figures "\$29,-350,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$27,500,000."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the committee feels that the amount named in the bill is as low as it is safe to go in the matter of subsistence for the coming year. As stated on Friday, the Committee on Appropriations cut the cost of the ration several cents below its present cost to-day. We cut it from its present cost of 42 cents to an estimate of 37 cents for the next fiscal year. We are taking quite an element of risk in cutting it that low, but believe it would be unsafe to go to a lower figure, because the War Department would have the right to bring in a deficiency, of course, for any amount it may cost them to feed the Army over that.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In ascertaining the amount is there anything in addition to what you call the constant items of the subsistence itself included in arriving at this figure?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know how much the constants are in the matter of subsistence. I imagine the constant cost is lower in the matter of subsistence than in any other item in the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What I am anxious to know is whether or not there is anything included in this amount other than-

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I think the cost of labor and cost of storing and all that is carried in other items in the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Kansas to the situation under this item according to his own statement. When the bill was reported providing for 168,000 men, the appropriation for subsistence was \$29,350,000. By action of the committee the enlisted personnel has been reduced to 150,000 men. Now, the gentleman from Kansas says that notwithstanding that reduction in the enlisted strength there should be no reduction in the amount of money appropriated for subsistence. Manifestly if that is true, the appropriation of \$29,000,000, which the gentleman now says is needed for 150,000 men, would have been entirely inadequate for 168,000 men. Now, I have taken the The gentleman says the ration figure trouble to calculate this. is 37 cents. If you will figure on 37 cents for 168,000 men it amounts to \$22,688,400, and in addition to that, according to the hearing before the committee, there should be included what they call the constant items of subsistence.

Those constant items of subsistence are set out in a table on page 540, based on an Army of 175,000 men. It includes, for instance, subsistence for 9,000 Philippine Scouts, when we have not, according to the hearings, more than 7,000. But even taking their figures, the figures of the War Department, the constants amount to but \$3,741,000, which added to the total of \$22,688,400 for 168,000 men would total only \$26,429,000. taking your 168,000 men at 37 cents each, throwing in \$3,741,000 under the head of the constant items of subsistence, you have only got \$26,429,000, and the bill provides \$29,350,000. But the situation is that the committee has reduced the personnel to 150,000 men, so let us calculate for 150,000 men, not at 37 cents, but allowing them 42 cents each, which is 100 per cent more than it was in 1914. Forty-two cents is what the ration costs Taking it for granted that there will be no decrease during the next year in the price of foodstuffs, and basing it on 5 cents more than the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. An-THONY] bases his figures on, 42 cents for 150,000 men amounts only to \$22,995,000. Then taking your constant items for an Army of 175,000 men, which amounts to \$3,741,000, it makes a total, based on 42 cents per man, of \$26,736,000. Then, just for good measure, I throw in another million dollars to make it \$27,500.000, which was the amount provided when the committee originally reported this bill in the last session. And I call your attention to the fact that providing not 37 cents but 42 cents and anyone can take a piece of paper and calculate it—and throwing in \$3,741,000 for constant items, then you are still \$1,000,000 under the amount previously carried in the bill, \$27,500,000, and here you are going to add \$2,000,000 more and make it \$29,000,000, the amount the gentleman wants to retain in this bill. Can the gentleman tell me where there is any other item besides these constant items that is included in the I have thrown in \$1,000,000 just for good measure, I have allowed 42 cents for rations per day instead of 37 cents, and I think the House is entitled to stand by the original recommendation of the committee for \$27,500,000 for an Army of 150,000 men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear that the gentleman is in favor of economy. I hope he will really be in favor of it when we reach items where there can be further deductions. As to this item, Mr. Chairman, the War Department estimates an expenditure of over \$31,000,000 even on the basis of an Army of 150,000 men. As I said on Friday, I thought at the time this bill was reported that the committee was rather low with this item, even on the basis of an Army of 150,000 men. We can not afford to take any chance of starving the Army of the United States. In any event, the law fixes the ration. The rations are bought in the market on competitive The amount expended would be the amount required to buy, at the market price, the number of rations necessary for the men who are in the establishment. So that if the same were reduced and a larger sum was necessary, there would be a deficiency. On the other hand, if any less sum is required, less would be spent. And this amount ought not to be reduced.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move as a substitute to

strike out the section. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized. Mr. BLANTON. I have made this pro forma motion merely

to get the floor. Mr. Chairman, the other day, as a basis for this large appropriation and the apparent surplus in it, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] called attention to the fact that the Navy ration allowance was much larger than that of the Army, and he indicated that the Navy ration was more elaborate and more extensive than that of the Army; in other words, that the Navy boys received more food and costlier

of the Army. Why, we all know that when a boat leaves a port and is on the high seas for thousands of miles before it reaches another port, that boat has to carry provisions at a much higher rate of cost than they could be procured for at Army camps. And the Navy must of necessity buy food at various foreign ports where the food costs much more than the Army has to pay for it.

Mr. HICKS. And there is also the question of spoilage. Mr. BLANTON. Yes. And everything they eat on a ship, and even drink, costs more than on land.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is not there the same chance of spoilage

Mr. BLANTON. They do not have to buy so much and do not have to keep it so long. They have to buy sometimes a different kind of food for ships than that which they use in camps on land. There is every reason why it should cost more. I can see plainly why the Navy ration costs more. But the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] says we should not starve our boys by cutting down this appropriation. There is no danger of starving them. This is one item upon which by law the Army has a right to create a deficiency if the Congress does not appropriate sufficient money. If we fail to appropriate sufficient money to feed the Army, we have not caused any injury to the Army, because the Quartermaster General can go, without the authority of Congress, and buy food sufficient to feed the Army, and then it is forced upon Congress to provide money to meet such deficiency. But, on the other hand, I will state to the gentleman from Wyoming whatever sums we ap-propriate, if too large, we can almost feel sure that the Army is going to find some way, somehow, under the law or otherwise, to spend the money.

It is much better, I assure my colleague, to follow the plan of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, even if he is a Democrat; to follow his suggestion of economy and save the money which is shown to be unnecessary. I want to say that ever since I have been in this House every move that has been suggested by a colleague, if it is good, I vote for, whether the move is proposed by a colleague on this side of the aisle or on the other side. Whether Republican or Democrat, I do not care. I do not look to his politics to find out whether I should vote for his proposition. I look to the merits of the proposition. The gentleman from South Carolina has very clearly disclosed here that it is unnecessary to appropriate at least two or three million dollars of the sum that we are providing in this bill. Well, if it is unnecessary, I am sure that you will accord to him good judgment on these matters. I am sure that you will accord to him a spirit of fairness, and I am sure that you will accord him good judgment on this question, and of the fact that he has given study and investigation of all subjects. If his idea is good, then you friends of ours on the other side of the aisle have no excuse for not following him and acting upon his suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the figures given by the gentleman from South Carolina may be approximately correct for 150,000 enlisted men in the Regular Army. But when you take into consideration the fact that this appropriation covers subsistence for a good many other men outside of the 150,000, it is found that the amount is not excessive. This covers subsistence for general prisoners, of which we have three or four thousand, and it covers the subsistence allowance of \$1.08 per day for the cadets at West Point, which runs at about \$500,000 a year. It also covers the subsistence for Indian guides and scouts, and for the subsistence of masters and officers and crews of transports, and employees of the vessels of the Army, of which there is a large number, which runs into rather large money. It also covers commutation of meals, including hot coffee and rations, to those men who are traveling and entitled to them under Army regulations. The very large sum of \$7,000,000 is estimated by the War Department for these The troops are constantly traveling, and they have to secure meals en route when they are away from their barracks, and that all runs into a large sum of money. It also includes items of meals for recruits, which usually runs into a large sum, although it is not expected that we shall have many recruits this year. But we have allowed for all these.

Mr. KAHN. What is the commutation allowance per man?

Mr. ANTHONY. The cost of the ration is 42 cents.

Mr. KAHN. That is much less than it was formerly?

Mr. ANTHONY. Very much less Mr. KAHN. It is coming down? Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. Very much less.

food than the boys in the Army.

Now, I understand that such is not the fact. I can see a real reason why the Navy ration should cost more than that

ferred to. The estimate for the cadets at the United States Military Academy is \$512,460. The estimate for the Philippine Scouts is \$906,883. But all of those items, embracing altogether 10 items, only make a total in the revised estimates of \$3,741,-423, which I have added in my figures.

Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The CHARMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 41, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jones of Texas: Page 24, line 9, insert as a new paragraph:

"The War Department is hereby directed to cancel and abandon the claim against the State of Texas in the sum of \$18,583.44, for United States property issued to the National Guard of Texas and lost, damaged, and destroyed during and immediately after the storm and flood at Corpus Christi, Tex., and surrounding country, September, 1919, the property having been furnished for the relief of the civilian population."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that?

No. I will make it. Mr. MONDELL.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I concede, Mr. Chairman, that it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REGULAR SUPPLIES.

Regular supplies of the Quartermaster Corps, including their care and protection; construction and repair of military reservation fences; stoves and heating apparatus required for the use of the Army for heating offices, hospitals, barracks and quarters, and recruiting stations, and United States disciplinary barracks; also ranges, stoves, coffee roasters, and appliances for cooking and serving food at posts in the field and when traveling, and repair and maintenance of such heating and cooking appliances; and the necessary power for the operation of moving-picture machines; authorized issues of candles and matches; for furnishing heat and light for the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, and enlisted men, warrant officers, and field-clerks, including enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty; contract surgeons when stationed at and occupying public quarters at military posts; for officers of the National Guard attending service and garrison schools; and for recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, offices, the buildings erected at private cost, in the operation of the act approved May 31, 1802, and buildings for a similar purpose on military reservations authorized by War Department regulations for all the operations and buildings for a similar purpose on military reservations anthorized war be partial to the conference of the construction and the operation, and the operation of the conference of the second of the construction and buildings lake overs and buildings for a similar purpose on military reservations authorized at respect to the second of the post of the second of the post of the second of the operation of the conference of the second of the operation of the construction and maintenance of modern batteries at establication of the second of the operation of the construction an

for the maintenance and repair of heating apparatus (other than stoves); not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and repair of electric wiring and fixtures; not to exceed \$10,000 for the repair and exchange of typewriters; not to exceed \$5,225,000 for fuel; not to exceed \$6,265,000 for forage, including salt and vinegar and bedding for animals, and straw for soldiers' bedding; not to exceed \$350,000 for ice; and not to exceed \$550,000 shall be expended for stationery: Provided, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell as soon as possible after the approval of this act, upon such terms and under such conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the best interests of the Government, such horses and mules now being held at remount stations and posts as are not in actual use, and in any event not less than 10,000 of such animals shall be sold: Provided further, That hereafter when, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, it is in the interest of the United States so to do, he is authorized to enter into contracts and to incur obligations for fuel in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements for one year without regard to the current fiscal year, and payments for supplies delivered under such contracts may be made from funds appropriated for the fiscal year in which the contract is made, or from funds appropriated or which may be appropriated for such supplies for the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. CONNALLLY of Texas rose,

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Anthony] a question. What is meant by the language, on lines 9 and 10 of page 25, "For sale to officers, and including also fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries and established posts"? What does that mean? It is the sale of what? What is the committee talking about?

Mr. ANTHONY. "Sales to officers, and including also fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries at established posts." Well, it is for sale of these supplies to officers.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. What supplies?

Mr. ANTHONY. Of the supplies covered in this item. The supplies are sold to officers and enlisted men.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That is the law now. You do not require any new legislation for that, do you?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is evidently carried in the bill for that purpose

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. This is an appropriation bill. Do

you carry on the appropriation to carry on the sale?

Mr. ANTHONY. This is to cover the expenses of such sales to officers, and the sums realized from such sales are, of course covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does it mean automobile bat-

teries? What are you talking about?

Mr. ANTHONY. It may mean a variety of things. The commissaries all over the country sell to officers and enlisted men and to the large number of employees. They probably buy any things from a spool of silk to a piece of machinery, for all I

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTATION OF THE ARMY AND ITS SUPPLIES.

TRANSPORTATION OF THE ARMY AND ITS SUPPLIES.

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including transportation of the troops when moving either by land or water, and of their baggage, including warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, including the cost of packing and crating; for transportation of recruits and recruiting parties, of applicants for enlistment between recruiting stations and recruiting depots; for travel allowance to officers and enlisted men on discharge; for payment of travel allowance as provided in section 3 of the act approved February 28, 1919, to enlisted men of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, and to members of the National Guard who have been mustered into the service of the United States and discharged on account of physical disability; for payment of travel pay to officers of the National Guard on their discharge from the service of the United States, as prescribed in the act approved March 2, 1901; for travel allowance to discharged prisoners and persons discharged from the Government Hospital for the Insane after transfer thereto from such barracks or place to their homes (or elsewhere as they may elect), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the place of last enlistment; of the necessary agents and other employees, including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4 for those authorized to receive the per diem allowance; of clothing and equipage and other quartermaster stores from Army depots or places of purchase or delivery to the several posts and Army depots and from those depots to the troops in the field; of horse equipment; of ordnance and ordnance stores, and small arms from the foundries and armories to the arsenals, fortifications, frontier posts, and Army depots; for payment of wharfage, tolls, and ferriages; for transportation of funds of the Army; for the payment o

dictions that such railroad should be a post route and military road subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and other Government services, and iso subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricted the charge for such Government transportation, having claims against the United States for transportation of troops and railroads, shall be paid out of the moneys appropriated by the, foregoing provisions only on the basis of such rate for the transportation of such troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property as the Secretary of War shall deem just and reasonable under the foregoing provision, such rate not to exceed 50 per cent of the compensation of such Government transportation as shall at that time be charged to and paid by private parties to any such company for like and similar transportation; and the amount so fixed to be made shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: Provided further, That nothing in the preceding provisors shall be construed to prevent the accounting officers of the Government from making full payment to anot come within the scope of the deductions provided for in the land-grant acts: for the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals in such numbers as are actually required for the service, including reasonable provisions for replacing unserviceable animals; for the purchase, hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of such harness, wagons, carts, drays, other vehicles, and horse-drawn passeager and provisions for replacing unserviceable animals; for the purchase, hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of such harness, wagons, carts, drays, other vehicles, and horse-drawn passeager and cartage at the exercial depots; for the repair of ships, boats, and other vessels on the various rivers, the dult of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, \$28,725,000: Provided. That the amounts to be expended from the transportation, \$10,200,000: and motor transportation, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, \$28,725,0

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hill: Page 34, line 10, after the word "purposes," insert "And provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the maintenance or operation by the War Department of any barge line or freight service between Baltimore, Md., and New Bern, N. C., carrying freight as a public carrier in competition with common carriers operated by private enterprise maintaining regular service."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, there is a barge line being run

between Baltimore and the point named. This amendment will save about \$60,000 or more a year.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order. Let us have the point of order disposed of.

Mr. ANTHONY. Then I withdraw the point of order.
Mr. BLANTON. I renew the point of order—that it is new legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law, and that it is not germane.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, it is not new legislation. It will save \$60,000 or more a year to the Government by preventing expenditures

Mr. BLANTON. There is nothing on its face to show that it comes within the Holman Rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a limitation? It simply provides that none of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for certain purposes. It seems to the Chair that it limits an appropriation which is being made here. If it does anything further, the Chair will examine and see if there is any positive legislation in it.

Mr. BLANTON. From the reading as I caught it I think it

goes further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will examine it. Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent. in lieu of remarks, to print letters from the Merchants' & Manufacturers Association of Baltimore City, the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, the Export and Import Board of Trade of Baltimore City, and Wathen & Co., vessel and barge owners, of Baltimore, and a table showing approximate salaries and various expenses of the Inland & Coastwise Waterways Service, Intra-

coastal Division, War Department.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order. Let us dispose of the point of order first. If it is in order, then the gentleman will have his opportunity to discuss it. I understood that the gentleman desired to expedite consideration of the bill, and for that reason I suggest that the point of order be disposed of first.

Then I ask unanimous consent, as I have indi-Mr. HILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, much as I regret it, I feel' impelled to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects. Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman

briefly.

Mr. HILL. Is this on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. On the point of order. That is the only thing now in order. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a barge line is intended to provide a better mode of transportation-a cheaper mode-than the ordinary transportation in use, to wit, in most cases railroads. I take it that these letters which our colleague from Maryland has asked to put into the Record come from competitive business interests, if you please. I made no objection to printing them in the RECORD because I thought the gentleman ought to be permitted to put them in for whatever they were worth.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do not see that this has anything to do with the point of order, and I make the point of order that the gentleman is not addressing himself to his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas on the point of order. The gentleman will confine him-

self to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. My mind is not as alert and brilliant as that of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. Walsh], but, according to its own light and the methods by which it does work, the remarks I was making did appear to me to be pertinent to the point of order, and I will try to confine the other remarks that I make to the point of order.

We have this barge line provided for to meet existing conditions. Certain methods for operating this barge line are provided for in this bill. The gentleman seeks to prevent any part of this appropriation from being spent on those barges. I take it that it must be competitive business interests only that do not want this barge line operated, the purpose of such barge line being to reduce freight charges and transportation rates in the interest of the whole people. On the face of it—

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the

point of order. The merits of the question are not now up for consideration. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order, pure and simple.

Mr. BLANTON. I submit that the amendment is not merely a limitation but that it goes further and that it changes present The present law authorizes this appropriation.

amendment offered by the gentleman is a change of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. It seems so clear to the Chair that the proposed amendment is purely a limitation that it hardly seems worth while to enlarge upon it; but the Chair will cite at least one decision almost exactly in point, which the Chair believes will satisfy even the gentleman from Texas. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the Chair yield for a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.
Mr. ANTHONY. Would it affect the status of the point of order if it should prove that the money for the operation of this barge line is not appropriated under this item of transportation by water but that it is appropriated in another measure? My information is that the money for the operation of this barge line comes from the item of transportation facilities on inland and coastwise waterways carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The Chair assumes that the gentleman The CHAIRMAN. from Maryland would not attempt to do a futile thing. If there is no appropriation for this purpose carried in this bill then it would be a futile thing to offer this amendment here.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am not positive that none of the funds are carried in this item for transportation in the Army bill or that none of those funds are used in the operation of this barge line, but it is a fact that the sundry civil bill did carry an item of \$4,000,000 for transportation facilities on inland and coastwise waterways under which the other barge lines and river routes are being operated by the War Department.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment it applies to any section of this act, as I understand that it is the entire act that comes under the purview of the gentleman's amendment, and not this particular

The CHAIRMAN. It would appear to the Chair that if germane at all to this bill it would properly come at this place, and it seems to the Chair that it might be made to include within its scope other paragraphs as well as the one to which it is offered. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amend-ment providing that none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the maintenance or operation by the War Department of any barge line or freight service between Baltimore, Md., and New Bern, N. C., and so forth. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is new legislation. The Chair will simply cite one or two decisions.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, to save time I withdraw the

point of order

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas withdraws his point of order and the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REAVIS. Was there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland to insert the letters in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objected

to the insertion of the papers.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma withdraw his objection, and I will file the letters because I do not want

to take up the time of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland renews his request to insert the papers in the RECORD. Is there objection? Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, I was not here to hear the preliminary statement of the gentleman from Maryland. I would like for my own information to know the source of the opposition to the continued operation of the barge

line which he is seeking to eliminate.

Mr. HILL. The barge line was put in operation between Baltimore and New Bern, N. C. The gentleman from Texas was right in what he said. The protest against the barge line comes from the Merchants' & Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, from the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, the Exporters and Importers Board of Trade, and Wharton & Co., shipowners. It comes, of course, because the local freight boats object to the Government competition against them, reducing the freight rates at the cost of the War Department. where the protest comes from. What the gentleman from Texas says is quite true. In addition to that I am for this amendment, and should not move the amendment were it not for the fact that here is an opportunity to prune off one of the activities of the War Department which are not proper activities of that department.

I am heartily for this bill which the committee has presented for proper national defense, but I am not for the department spending money of the people of the United States to run an experimental barge line in competition with the private barge lines running under rates established by the Interstate Commerce Commission. So it is absolutely true, as the gentleman from Texas says, but here is a chance to save \$60,000 a year, and I hope the House will adopt the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman spoke of the Government engaging in competition with the transportation facilities. want to call his attention to the fact that the War Department now maintains hundreds of big, heavy powered motor trucks that it uses for the transportation of material and men across the country. That in a way competes with common carriers. Is the gentleman against the Government using motor trucks?

Mr. HILL. No. There is this difference. I should make no objection to the Government using its own property and means of transportation for transporting different things that it owns, and using its trucks to transport war material and other Government materials, but if these trucks carry ordinary freight as ordinary common carriers I should object. I should like to object to the whole practice of barge lines, but I did not feel justified in doing anything except that which relates to my own district

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I want to ask the gentleman does this barge line carry freight for individuals indiscriminately along the route, or do they carry exclusively Government freight?

Mr. HILL. They carry for individuals along the route. Mr. KINCHELOE. How long have they been doing that? Mr. WARD of North Carolina. A little over 30 days.

Mr. HILL. I have all the information; if the gentleman will

get me an extension of time I will read it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. That is rather an unusual situationbarge lines carrying freight of individuals in competition with other business.

Mr. HILL. I think it is a wrong situation. May I again ask unanimous consent to put these papers in the RECORD without reading them?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I think but very few know what is contained in those papers, and I think the gentleman can without doubt get an extension of time and give us the information.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman understand how the War Department got its authority to operate these barges as a common carrier?

Mr. HILL. I will read that information, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I quote from a letter from W. D. Connor, colonel of the Corps of Engineers, Chief Inland Coastwise Waterways Service:

wise Waterways Service:

Under a joint resolution approved February 28, 1921, the section above referred to was amended as follows:

"Resolved, etc, That at the end of 30 days after the passage of this resolution the authority conferred upon the Secretary of War under section 201 of the transportation act, 1920, to operate for commercial purposes boats, barges, tugs, or other transportation facilities upon the New York State Barge Canal shall cease, and thereafter there shall be no such operation by the Secretary of War or any other agency of the United States. The Secretary of War shall, as soon as is practicable, dispose of boats, barges, tugs, and other transportation facilities purchased or constructed for use upon said canal, and, pending final disposition, the Secretary of War may lease the same: Provided, That all the money obtained from the sale or lease of these boats, barges, and tugs shall be available until expended by the Inland and Coastwise Waterways Service of the War Department in the inauguration and development of other inland, canal, and coastwise waterways in accordance with the expressed desire of Congress in section 500 of the transportation act, 1920: Provided further, That not to exceed 25 per cent of the boats, barges, and tugs built or purchased for the United States herein authorized to be sold may be retained by the United States for the operation of other inland, canal, or coastwise routes of the United States until such equipment can be replaced by other equipment to be purchased from funds received from the sale prescribed above."

You will observe from this that the authority to operate is unquestioned, and further, the last provision of the joint resolution was inserted with the expressed purpose of using the barges, etc., in operation on the intracoastal line.

I now proceed with the letter from Col. Connor. I might

I now proceed with the letter from Col. Connor. I might say this is his reply to the objection to the authority of the War Department for conducting such a line:

This service is not inclined to develop waterways unless Congress sees fit to have it done. The matter of the installation of the intracoastal line between Baltimore, Md., and New Bern, N. C., was very
carefully investigated and considered, and the result of the investigation laid before the then Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, who indorsed the paper as follows:
"Approved. We should do everything we can to demonstrate the
value of the service and this seems wise and helpful."
The primary reasons advanced by the leading citizens of North Carolina for the installation of this line was that the terminal rates enjoyed
by certain cities in North Carolina on the Neuse River, Pamilico River,

and Albemarle Sound were about to be lost due to the fact that there were no waier lines established with which the rallroad could make folir rates. The matter was brought to the attention of this service by Senator Simmons, of North Carolina, and a committee representing the business interests of North Carolina touching upon these waterways. A statement was made by them that the loss to that section of the country, due to the discontinuance of terminal rates, would aggregate approximately \$1,000,000 per year. Senator Simmons and the committee placed forceably before this service the benefits to be derived from the establishment of such a line.

Upon investigation it was found that there was a good inland waterway connection, and the establishment of a barge line would be an experiment which, if successful, would aid largely in the development of water traffic between North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland, and largely aid in the development of the commercial resources of these States.

At the time of the inauguration of this service under the authority of the Secretary of War, there were under construction at New Bern, N. C., and about ready for delivery, three self-propelled barges designed for use on the main section of the New York State Canal. In view of the fact that these barges would be completed too late to be of any service on the New York State Canal, which, in addition, had all the equipment necessary to move the traffic that would be offered, and the further fact that these barges would be illed or rented, it appeared to be a propitious moment to use these three vessels, together with six steel carso barges, in the establishment of a branch barge line between New Bern and Baltimore. The New York Canal section, under the Raliroad Administration, operated as far south as Philadelphia, and this line was merely an extension of the New York Canal section at that time. It was under such authority that the original line was operated, and it is under the authority contained in the John tresolution approved

Was operated by the Government."

He objects to the policy of the Inland and Coastwise Waterways Sertice. Certainly the people of the United States are entitled to use water transportation if they can get any cheaper rates than all-rall transportation, and he is quarreling with the policy of Congress, not the policy of this service, when he objects to the efforts of the Government to prove that water transportation is more satisfactory and more economical than rail transportation for certain commodities.

Without entering into a controversy, it can be stated positively to you as a fact that since the inauguration of the barge line on the Mississippi River the freight rates from port to port on the Mississippi have considerably increased and the rates from city to city in the inland have decreased in proportion to the increase of rates on the river ports. Before the inauguration of this line it was the custom of rallroads to carry freight from river port to river port or to river teminal at such a low rate that private steamship companies or barge owners could not compete with them and the corresponding rate in the interior was several times higher.

"In other words, in order to make the railroad a paying investment, the people of the interior was a several times higher."

In other words, in order to make the railroad a paying investment, the people of the interior were paying excess rates and the people ong rivers were getting advantages at the expense of the taxpayers as

a whole.

There was considerable opposition on the part of several concerns to our extending the line into Philadelphia. Upon an exposition of our aims and policy in the matter an amicable agreement was apparently reached with the protestants.

I trust that I have not been too prolix in my statements, but I desired to state our position and let you know that we feel we are doing what Congress intended us to do, and if Congress desires to change its policy the service will as faithfully and as loyally carry it out, as it is carrying out its present policy.

Very respectfully,

W. B. CONNOR, Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Chief Inland and Coastwise Waterways Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three minutes longer. I am very much interested in the matter; it is right at my door; it is getting near my home.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think there ought to be some limit to this discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Mr. MADDEN and Mr. BANKHEAD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama was on his

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment. All the Members of the Congress who were Members when the Congress passed the transportation act of 1920 will recall after great deliberation provision was made in that

bill for the inauguration under the supervision of the War Department of certain inland and coastwise water lines to be operated by the Government. That was done, Mr. Chairman, on the theory that it would be the start of at least some measure for the relief of the congested traffic of the railroads and more essentially for the purpose of providing competition and reducing the exorbitant transportation rates which were charged by the railroad companies. As I understood the letter of Col. Connor, as read by the gentleman from Maryland, the line of barges which he is seeking to destroy is one of the inland transportation lines that went into effect under the provisions and by the authority of that provision of the transportation act, and it seems to me, gentlemen of the committee, that it would be extremely unfortunate if we should discontinue any branch of that service which has now reached a stage where it begins to show practical and actual results, and that would be done if this amendment, without mature consideration by the proper authorities, without consideration by any committee having exclusive jurisdiction over this question of inland waterway transportation, should be adopted. That is the matter presented to the committee and ought to cause it to hesitate before favorably acting upon the proposed amendment.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will.

Mr. REAVIS. The statement was made by the gentleman from Maryland that these boats operate under the authority of the War Department and carry freight for a much less price than private concerns, and what I want to ask the gentleman is with reference to the element of fairness of one commission of the Government fixing a price for a private concern, the Inter-state Commerce Commission, and another bureau of the Government doing the same business for less money than the Gov-

ernment will permit the private concerns to do it for.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the gentleman in reply as a general proposition I do not believe in Government ownership of public utilities in competition with private business. The question asked points out the danger, I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska, of adopting this amendment at this time. We have only had an ex parte statement here that proceeds from the owners of these other steamboat companies. If the letter of Col. Connor had been concluded, it might have shown that down at the terminal in North Carolina there were no adequate steamship facilities for handling local coastwise trade. so that they afforded opportunity to have joint rail and water rates, the very purpose of this inland waterway system. If you are going to indorse a proposition like this to undermine and seek to destroy the whole purpose and effect of your inland waterway transportation system, it ought to be done after careful and very judicial consideration of all the facts on both sides of the question.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will

Mr. WALSH. Is there a barge line also in operation upon the Black Warrior River?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Exactly; and that is the very reason of knowledge of the value of this proposition, not only upon the Black Warrior River but, the gentleman should also remember, on the Mississippi River. The people along the great Mississippi Valley, as well as adjacent to the Black Warrior, are deeply interested in this question of competition in order to relieve the exorbitant freight charges of the railroads, and that service under Government operation in competition with the railroads paid a net profit of \$50,000 during the month of April and at the same time helped to render the shippers and business men of that section of the country adequate facilities, especially along the Mississippi and Warrior Rivers, and at a saving of 20 per cent in freight rates for goods carried on those rivers.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. BANKHEAD. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Would not the effect of this amendment, if adopted, repeal so much of this transportation act as affects this particular line, without any consideration—
Mr. BANKHEAD. Absolutely. I do not think the gentleman

from Maryland would deny that proposition.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does the gentleman know how much the loss was on this transportation business of the Black Warrior River and the Mississippi last year?

Mr. BANKHEAD. They operated at a substantial loss, be-

cause of the inadequacy of the equipment and terminal facilities.

Mr. LINTHICUM. They lost

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like an opportunity to answer the gentleman-of course, they lost money-it is not denied; but they are not losing money now; that is the proposition; because they had to build up this system from the ground up; they had to wait for months and months for equipment. They had to get their organization and their equipment, and get it framed upon a

scientific business basis, and although it was in its experimental stage and they did lose money at first, it was in a position to render substantial service, especially to the public along the great Mississippi Valley and in Alabama and that important section of the country. Here is a proposition to take this benefit away from these people in this particular case; I do not know what the facts are; it might be that after a full hearing of the facts I might agree to the amendment.

But I say that it would be extremely unfortunate, and I think unfair, for this committee, without any consideration of the real facts from both sides of the case, to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Hill] without any notice to the friends of inland waterway and coastwise systems, without giving them an opportunity to present their case, and to have their day in court. I regard this amendment as the forcrunner of a wholesale attack on our inland waterway and barge systems. If so, we will be prepared to

fight such an effort to the finish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Reserving the right to object, I would like to make another unanimous-consent request, to the effect that all debate on the paragraph and pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REAVIS. There was a unanimous-consent request pending at the time the motion was made.

The CHAIRMAN. But the regular order was demanded.

Mr. WALSH. If necessary to get it, I will object.

Mr. REAVIS. The regular order, Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will pardon me, was my request that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] have an extension of two minutes. The CHAIRMAN. Whereupon the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Walsh] objected to it.

Mr. REAVIS. There was no objection to it, as I understand it.

Mr. MacGREGOR. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Mr. MADDEN. I hope the gentleman from Kansas will withhold his motion.

Mr. ANTHONY. We have got to make progress. We want

to get through the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr.

MACGREGOB] will submit his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I have an amendment to this paragraph at the Clerk's desk, which has not been read. Is that covered

by the gentleman's request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment would be in order, and unless the time for debate has expired the gentleman will have an opportunity to debate it.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I will liberalize my motion

by moving that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Hill] and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves that all debate on the Hill amendment and all amendments thereto

close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY, I move to extend it for 40 minutes. This may involve the whole Government scheme of inland waterways. Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move as a substitute to make it 30 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], modifying the time stated by the gentleman from Kansas. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden] moved a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute will come next. The noes have it, and the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky is not agreed to. The question is now on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken, and the substitute amendment was

agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Man-

DEN] is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] and to some extent agree with him that competition by the Government ought not to exist as against private enterprise. But in the transportation act which we passed last year it was specifically provided that the Government should enter upon an experimental work of water transportation development. The Government did that because it was believed the time had come when we must correlate water transportation with the rail transportation of the country. Everybody realized that unless we could get joint rates between the railroads and water we would not be able to function in matters of transportation as we should. And it was realized that during the experimental stages the Government was bound to lose money on the experiment. The War Department was bound to lose money on the experiment. authorized to establish barge lines, because private capital could not be secured for that purpose. The War Department has entered upon the work, and they have constructed special classes of tugs that are peculiarly fitted for certain kinds of work in water transportation. Now comes the gentleman from Maryland with his proposition because, perchance, a resolution was passed by the Congress not long since modifying the transportation act to the extent of ordering the sale of the barge line operated by the Government on the New York Barge Canal. But there is quite a difference between the barge line on the Erie Canal and the proposal submitted by the gentleman from Maryland. The people of New York State built the barge canal out of their own pockets.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the gentleman tell us how extensive

this is?

Mr. MADDEN. The people of New York State built that canal at their own expense, and they maintain it. All the citizens of New York State who are interested in water transportation were obliged to abandon their investments. But here is a different proposal. The Albemarle and the Intercoastal Canals were purchased by money out of the Treasury of the United States, and the United States maintains those water-ways. And if there is any place in the country where the Government has a right to engage in this sort of work it is on the waterway suggested by the gentleman from Maryland.

Now, as a general proposition, I am not in favor of the Government doing this sort of work. I want to leave it to private business and to private enterprise. But here is a case where we were unable to find men with capital who were willing to engage in the work we were about to try to develop.

It has been maintained for many years that the only way you could take advantage of all the transportation facilities, water and rail combined, was to have terminals at which the freight that goes by the waterways could be transferred on joint rates to the railroads, and vice versa. And we charge the War Department with the responsibility of functioning in this thing, and we have appropriated \$4,000,000 to carry it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois

has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from

Illinois may have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been limited to 30 minutes altogether by vote of the committee.

Mr. REAVIS. Has the chairman a list of the gentlemen

to whom this time will be given?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has a list, and the amounts are all written out. The Chair does not know how he can get out with it.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. I really wanted 10 minutes to explain what the situation is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated what the understanding is. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to object to the gentleman proceeding, but-

The CHAIRMAN. No objection is heard.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, if we permit the amendment offered
by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Hill] to be adopted, it would destroy the very function which we have been imposing upon the War Department, and we would be doing it in a bill which has no relation whatever to the subject.

Yr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? .

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. My colleague [Mr. Linthicum] is entirely right. This does not in any way interfere with the expenditures under the other bill. I wish by this amendment to provide that they can not expend any deficit under the other bill out of this bill for transportation.

Maddle Manager of the second of the s

Mr. HILL. Because the general manager of this line receives \$7,500 a year as salary, and the chief clerk receives \$2,500, and the salaries for this little tiny line aggregate in all \$27,000 a year.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with what the gentleman is saying and with the position he takes, but has the gentleman information as to the activity of this barge line in

charging a less rate than the competitive lines?

Mr. MADDEN. No; but I know the Government is losing money on their transportation activities, but I believe it is well spent, because it correlates with the development that the people of the country are hoping and praying for.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Lin-

THICUM] will be recognized.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the question involved in the amendment offered to the Army appropriation bill by my colleague from Maryland [Mr. Hill] prohibiting the use of any funds therein for the operation of the inland and coast-wise waterways, especially as applied to the line operating between Baltimore and Norfolk, Va., and New Bern and Washington, N. C., is whether the Government should continue that service in competition with private interests which have been established for years and given satisfaction, and where keen competition already exists, when the Government does it by cutting rates and at a loss in actual dollars and cents to the

During the war, in order to facilitate transportation and to relieve the heavy burden upon the railroads, the National Government operated barges on the Mississippi and Warrior Rivers, and upon the canals of New York, and as far south as Philadelphia. In 1920, by the transportation act, the operation of these barges was, under section 201-A, transferred to the War Department to be operated upon lines then established and operated under Federal control, and were subsequently operated under the intracoastal canal section and inland and coastwise waterways service of that department. The competition in New York was so keenly felt and was so rapidly driving private business to the wall in that State that Congress on February 28, 1921, by resolution declared that at the expira-tion of 30 days after the passage of the resolution the authority conferred upon the Secretary of War under said section 201-A of the transportation act of 1920 to operate for commercial purposes boats, barges, tugs, or other transportation upon the New York Barge Canal should cease, and authorized disposal of the boats, the money to be used in inauguration and development of other inland canals or coastwise waterways, in accordance with section 500 of the transportation act of 1920.

This section 500 of the transportation act did not embody any provisions which would authorize the establishment of new routes or new service, but provided for the building, increasing, and developing inland waterway transportation, to investigate with a view to devising the types most appropriate for this location, to advise and cooperate, and to investigate the existing status of transportation upon inland waterways with a view to determining whether such waterways are being utilized to the extent of their capacity and whether they are interchanging traffic with the railroads, and to investigate any other matter that may tend to promote and encourage inland

waterway transportation.

We contend, therefore, that the establishment of the lines from Baltimore which were not in operation during the war and established under Federal control was illegal and unauthorized; that it is against the policy of the Government to enter into direct competition with private enterprise, crippling and destroying the same, and either bankrupting or driving it to other sections of the country.

I can not say that many people would not welcome a very much reduced freight rate, even at the expense of governmental competition, but the fact of the matter is this, that it is not the intention of the Government to continue this competition but merely to demonstrate it, and if in a little while these Govern-ment boats are not withdrawn the local enterprise will have either been driven to other sections of the country or will have become bankrupt, and the city of Baltimore will find itself without transportation, which had been privately owned and had taken years with unlimited labor and capital to develop.

According to a statement just received from Col. Conner, of the War Department, this service from Baltimore south had a deficit in-

December, 1920______ January, 1921_____ February, 1921_____ March, 1921_____ April, 1921_____ \$12, 946 17, 870 7, 902 5, 857

The service has been largely augmented, because when New York drove them out of its domains they brought their barges to Baltimore, increasing their service from two weeks' sailings to five days. It is also a fact that since the Government came here we have 100 local barges belonging to our own peof'e tied up in the harbor with nothing to do. I do not attribute all of this to the bringing of 22 Government barges here of 8,800 tonnage, but it is quite manifest that these private lines can not compete with the resources of the United States Treasury through lines run there at a great loss by the War Department. I am in receipt of copy of letter of April 21 last addressed to

Admiral William S. Benson, chairman of the Shipping Board, from the Northern Transportation Co., which calls attention to the fact that the Shipping Board has just leased some of its boats at a bare bottom charge of 50 cents per dead-weight ton to carry coal. This will enable the charterer of these boats to carry coal at 50 per cent of the actual cost to vessel owners. This coasting trade has already a large surplus tonnage for the work, and naturally this Government competition will seriously affect private operation. This company has 74,000 deadweight tons in barges and a steamer of which only 6,000 tons are now in operation. This placing of boats in competition at 50 cents per ton bare bottom charge will most likely drive this 6,000 tons off the sea and will not benefit the consumer but

add profit to dealers and operators.

There is another unfair side to this matter. Private enterprise on the coastwise trade is governed by rates allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and while the Government files rates and professes to operate under the Interstate Commerce Commission regulations it is also true the Interstate Commerce Commission has no governmental control over them whatever or any rate they may charge, while the individual is absolutely submissive to their regulations. It can not be said by the Government that it is not in competition and cutting rates against private owners, because that fact was positively admitted by Mr. Morris, of the War Department, and of this service, at a meeting held in Philadelphia, 308 Walnut Street, when in answer to a question as to why he had made rates so low he said, "As I stated above, that it was on account of private interests quoting lower." The taxpayers are compelled to stand all losses. At that same meeting, on March 24, 1921, in Philadelphia, a very careful analysis was given showing that the Government was carrying lumber from New Bern, N. C., to Philadelphia at \$4.50 per 1,000 feet, and as the steamer Orange carried 175,000 feet of lumber the total amount earned by the boat for the trip was \$787.50; and an itemized statement showed that, according to the Government's admissions, the boat could not be operated for less than \$7,000, including overhead charges and interest. I think this statement of sufficient interest to insert it at this point:

COST TO TAXPAYERS.

At the same meeting in Philadelphia on March 24, 1921, Mr. John J. Dempsey, of Dempsey & Sons, barge operators, of Philadelphia, stated as follows:

Mr. Dempsey. We understand the Government is carrying lumber from New Bern or Washington, N. C., to Philadelphia for \$4.50 per 1,000 feet. The steamer carries 175.000 feet of lumber. The gross freight is about \$787.50. It would cost the Government about \$4.000 to earn that. The steamer Orange, 150 feet long, 12 feet draft, capacity 400 tons, valued at \$100,000, wages of crew for—

Per month.

re	month
9 men Provisions for crew Fuel, about 696 gallons of oil, 30 days Port charges, about	360
Insurance, 9 per cent	800 100 500 400

would be the running expenses for a steamer to earn \$1,000, two trips a month from Baltimore to Washington, N. C., and back. If the Government can make anything at \$1.25 per ton with this expense I can not see it.

Mr. LLOTD. At what do you figure fuel oil?

Mr. Dempsey. At 7 cents a gallon.

Mr. LLOYD. You are a trifle high.

Mr. Dempsey. How much am I too high?

Mr. LLOYD. About \$1,500. The other figures are correct, but you are \$1,500 too high on fuel oil.

It would be indicated, even with this reduction, that the cost of operation of the steamer Orange would approximate \$7,000 a month; and if this is to be taken as correct, as stated by Mr. Lloyd, who is apparently the chief of the engineering service, inland and coastwise waterways, it would appear that there is some reason for the deficits on the Mississippi and Warrior Rivers.

It is quite evident that the Government has not and can not operate this transportation service in competition with private enterprise except at a very heavy drain upon the United States Treasury. I do not contend that the Government should not even at a loss operate certain water transportation for the benefit of the people where there is no transportation facilities, or where it is necessary to reduce railroad rates, but I do contend that it is unfair, unjust, and unbusinesslike to operate at a loss this transportation service from Baltimore south when private interests have built up large transportation companies, have operated them successfully, and where lively competition already exists between several lines so owned.

As a further proof of what I say about governmental loss in these matters I desire to bring to the attention of the committee the report of the War Department, issued for the year 1920.

Report of operation for fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

[From report of Chief of Inland and Coastwise Waterways Service to the Secretary of War, pp. 115-116, 130-131, 138.]

Month.	New York section.	Mississippi River section.	Warrior River section.
July	6, 757, 71 38, 487, 10 1, 786, 64 27, 589, 27 12, 977, 96 12, 294, 82 5, 384, 98		\$27, 360. 37 38, 477. 21 53, 653. 37 62, 232. 19 16, 606. 30 26, 843. 34 16, 217. 49 21, 850. 32
June	82, 193, 14	431, 729. 31	262, 674. 61

Recapitulation.

DEFICIT FROM OPERATION.	
New York section: Apr. 1 to June 30, 1918 July 1 to June 30, 1919 July 1 to June 30, 1920	506, 807. 38
Total	651, 669. 66
Mississippi River section: Sept. 18 to June 30, 1919 June 30, 1920	422, 168. 05 592, 032. 69
Total	1, 014, 200. 74
Warrior River section: September, 1918, to June 30, 1919 June 30, 1920	38, 523. 43 295, 398. 41
Total	333, 921. 84
Chand total	1 000 700 04

I do not mean to say some of these enterprises were not worth while and during the war highly essential, nor do I, to repeat what I have already said, contend that they should not be operated in certain places where exigencies arise, even at a loss to the United States Treasury, which may not, however, be a loss to the country generally by virtue of benefits, lowering of freight rates, and so forth. It is understood, of course, that wherever a railroad and water transportation reach the same place the railroad is allowed and does reduce its freight to meet the water competition. This is very beneficial in the reduction of freight, but the result usually is that the boat line is driven off by the competition and ceases to exist, freights go up, and

no other boat company has the temerity to enter the contest.

It will be remembered that one of the first things President
Harding said upon taking office was that he desired to eliminate the Government from private business. This same policy was manifested by Congress when it transferred to the owners the railroad companies of the country; when it provided for the continuation of certain inland waterways it was the intention that they should be operated where profitable and later dispose of these transportation facilities to private owners, thus eliminating the Government from private enterprise. It is certainly not the intention of the Government to continue in competition with private enterprise, and certainly not the desire of the taxpayers of the country to continue such operation at a tremendous loss to the United States Treasury.

I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted: that the Government will only operate where it is essential, but will not compete with private parties where competition is already in existence and where rates are fair and reasonable. Certainly no one can say that Baltimore is not well supplied with water transportation. It has been abundantly supplied for years and the acceleration given to this line of business by the war has given it a superabundance of transportation facilities. Baltimore enjoys a cheap freight rate to the Central West; it is the gateway to the South and North; it has realized this fact for years and has built accordingly-water transportation, railroad transportation, docks; piers have been constructed-and we are thoroughly capable of taking care of everything which comes into our gates without loss to the United States Government and without its competition where competition already [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mary-

land has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter. I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the same privilege. Mr. MADDEN. And I ask, Mr. Chairman, the same privi-

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Bank-HEAD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my

remarks by inserting these letters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the letters referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following are the letters referred to:

MERCHANTS AND MANUFACTURERS'
ASSOCIATION OF BALTIMORE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, April 13, 1921.

Hon. John Philip Hill, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: At a meeting of the board of directors of this organiza-tion held this day attention was directed to the operation of a barge line by the Inland and Coastal Waterways Service of the War Depart-ment between Baltimore, Norfolk, New Bern, and Washington, N. C. The board placed itself on record as being opposed to the operation of this barge line by the Government, as there is adequate water transportation service between the points named being afforded by the water lines now in operation.

service between the points named being anotated in operation.

This reaffirms the position of this association, as indicated by its opposition to the bill introduced during the last session of Congress providing for the Government operation of the Muscle Shoals nitrate plant, as well as its action in connection with other legislation of this character, indicating that it is unalterably opposed to the Government entering into business in competition with private enterprise.

All of which I am sending to you for your information.

Yery truly, yours,

R. J. Beacham, Secretary.

Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, Office of the President, Baltimore, April 14, 1921,

Hon. JOHN PHILIP HILL,

Hon. John Philip Hill,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: The intracoastal division of the War Department has for some months past been operating a barge line between Baltimore, Md., and Norfolk, Va., Washington, N. C., and Newbern, N. C. As these points are adequately served by regularly established steamship lines, with railroad connections, furnishing daily service, we believe Government operation should cease. In our opinion, consideration should be shown those who have established these steamship lines and invested their capital in them, and it is neither fair nor just to them to be compelled to compete with the Government barge lines.

The Baltimore Chamber of Commerce therefore joins with the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, which has forcibly placed this question before you, in protesting against further operation of barge lines by the Government.

Very truly, yours.

George S. Jackson, President.

EXPORT AND IMPORT BOARD OF TRADE OF BALTIMORE (INC.), Baltimore, Md., May 2, 1921.

Hon. John P. Hill, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the board of directors of the Export and Import Board of Trade of Baltimore held Tuesday, April 26, 1921, it was unanimously resolved—

"That we protest against the inauguration and operation of inland steamship or barge line services for the carriage of merchandise for the general public by any bureau or department of the United States Government in competition with privately owned vessels of established common carriers whose rates, rules, and regulations are subject to con-

trol by the act to regulate commerce, the transportation act, the shipping act, the merchant marine act, the law of common carriers, and admiralty law; and

"That the general manager of this organization be requested to coorganize with the officials of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore and of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce in the
effort to have withdrawn such governmental undertakings of this nature
as are now in operation; and

"That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Representatives from
the State of Maryland in both Houses of Congress."

Very truly, yours,

W. M. BRITTAIN, General Manager.

W. M. BRITTAIN, General Manager.

Approximate salaries and various expenses of the Inland and Coastwise Waterways Service, Intracoastal Division, War Department.

and the state of t	Month.	Year.
Mr. Morris, general manager, also traffic manager. Mr. Person, chief clerk. Mr. Burroughs, auditor. Mr. Simmons, agent. Mr. Lloyd, port engineer. Bookkeeper. Shipping clerk. 3 stenographers, at \$100 each.	\$583, 33 200, 00 275, 00 300, 00 300, 00 200, 00 125, 00 300, 00	\$7,000.60 2,400.00 3,300.00 3,600.00 3,600.00 2,400.00 1,500.00 3,600.00
	2, 283. 33	27, 400. 00

There are agents in Norfolk, Va., New Bern and Washington, N. C. These salaries do not include the labor for loading and unloading

Salaries for one steam barge.

	Month.	Year.
Captain Chief engineer First mate. Second engineer Cook 2 firemen, at \$90 each 2 deck hands, at \$90 each	\$210. 00 200. 00 180. 00 180. 00 110. 00 180. 00 180. 00	\$2, 520. 00 2, 400. 00 2, 160. 00 2, 160. 00 1, 320. 00 2, 160. 00 2, 160. 00
\$0.90 per day is paid to each man for food, 30 days per month, or \$243.	1, 240. 00	14, 880. 00 2, 160. 00 17, 796. 00

They are now operating three of these barges from Baltimore to New Bern and Washington, N. C., making a total of \$53,388.

This does not include the oil for running or fuel and repairs. There is an average of from 15 to 18 tons of freight on each trip at present. Each steam barge must carry 100 tons going south, also coming back to Baltimore, to meet expenses.

They now have six barges anchored in the stream. They have twe men on these barges at \$100 per month each. There is a man on each one of these barges when running.

The rent at Broadway Pier for wharfage and storage is \$300 per month. Salaries, office, \$27,400 per year; salaries, three barges, \$53,388 per year.

Beginning on the 1st day of May, 1921, when the line will operate from Pier No. 5, the annual rental will be \$4,998 and in addition 125 per cent per annum upon the cost of the erection of the shed, said shed to cost about \$12,000.

WATHEN & Co., Baltimore, April 7, 1921.

Hon. J. P. Hill,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: We write these lines to see if you can not help the owners of inland vessels and barges and tugboats out. We people have boats tied up with nothing to do. The War Department has power tugboats and barges running at very low freights. They take stuff for about one-third cheaper than we could run for and are going in debt several thousand dollars per month, that we tug owners help to make good. We people bought Liberty bonds, and a great many of us more than we were able to buy, and now our Government almost puts us out of business.

Thanking you.

Very respectfully, yours,

Wathen & Co.

The CHAIRMAN The Chair will recognize the gentlement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Hill]. The reason why I am opposed to it is because it certainly would not be the part of wisdom to bring in an amendment on an appropriation bill which would cut off

a part of the barge service.

I think it would not be wise to adopt the amendment. However, I am thoroughly in accord with the spirit of the amendment, because the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Hill] is opposed to competition by Government owned and operated boats with privately owned boats. I think this Congress in a short time ought to take up and consider the advisability of doing away with Government-owned barges and boats and with Government-owned transportation in any case where it comes in competition with private ownership.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does not the gentleman think it would be better for legislation on the subject to come from the committee that has jurisdiction of all of them, so that we will have proper and accurate information on the subject?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I am in accord with the gentle-man's suggestion. The whole matter ought to be taken up at one time. It ought to be given thorough consideration by a committee at a time when hearings can be had and the whole matter can be gone into thoroughly, and then it ought to be presented to the House as a whole.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts

Mr. WALSH. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the appropriation for all of this service has been made in the sundry civil bill, and that all this amendment will do will be to inhibit the use of any War Department money?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The appropriation for this service is not provided in this bill, so this amendment would have no effect whatever.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. If it would have no effect whatever, of course it is not a useful amendment and therefore ought not to be adopted. If it has any effect at all, its effect will be to destroy this particular barge service, which is one unit of the barge service that ought to be considered as a whole.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In connection with the statement of the gentleman allow me to say that the entire appropriation for the inland and coastwise waterways service is turned over to the

War Department to administer.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. This amendment is a limitation upon the particular appropriation in this act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted. Members of the House will recall that when the transportation act was passed the Government found itself in possession of a lot of barges, some of which had been completed and some of which were under construction. These barges had been purchased by the Government in order to put boats upon the inland waterways of the United States under Federal control, under the same Railway Administration that controlled the railroads. When we passed the act returning the railroads to their owners, Congress did not feel that the Government ought to disband its organization or stop its experiment in the building up of inland waterway transportation. Consequently the law provided that the Government should not only use the boats which had been purchased and those which were under construction, but that it should be able to buy more, and a revolving fund was created and an appropriation made for the use of the War Department under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers. Now the Government has this service upon the Black Warrior River and upon the Mississippi River. did have it upon the New York Barge Canal, and only in the last session of Congress we authorized the Secretary of War to sell the Government boats on the New York Barge Canal or to use them in other parts of the United States in order to establish water transportation. About 30 or 40 days ago, I understand, the War Department brought some of these barges, that originally were on the New York Barge Canal, down to Baltimore to establish this service between Baltimore and New Bern, N. C. I do not care to go into the merits of ultimate Government operation of the transportation system. I think ultimately the Government will have to go out of the barge-line business. We are in it now not as a money-making scheme, not in order to compete with private enterprise, but in order to demonstrate that under favorable conditions water transportation can be carried on in the United States at a profit, and whenever the Government has demonstrated that fact to private industry, then it will be time for the Government to go out of the business and permit private industry to take it over.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is to become of the interests of individual vessel and barge owners while the Government is

demonstrating that?

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is any very great damage being done to private industry, certainly the proper committee ought to take it up and investigate it and bring in a bilt to relieve that condition; but if we can stop this line from Baltimore to New Bern by an amendment to the Army appropriation bill, then somebody who is interested in a private line on the Mississippi River can offer an amendment and have the barge line on the Mississippi River disbanded and somebody on the Black Warrior River can do the same thing there, and so by piecemeal we can destroy all these Government-owned lines, and the committee that has charge and jurisdiction of that legislation will have no opportunity to investigate it. What ought to be done is to vote this amendment down. It has no place on the Army appropriation bill at all. It is a matter of interstate commerce, but it was put in charge of the Chief of Engineers of the War

Department because the Engineer force of the War Department has more knowledge of the inland waterways and conditions of transportation than any other particular branch of the Gov-For that reason it was put there.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Briefly.

Mr. HILL. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] pointed out, this does not cut off any existing appropriation made under any previous act, but simply provides that under this bill the War Department can not spend any money

for general transportation on these losing projects.

Mr. BARKLEY. Placed on that basis it ought not to be adopted, because there is no information here except the protests of private boat lines against this line between Baltimore and these points below. Besides that, there is no evidence here that there is any private boat line that runs from Baltimore to New Bern. I understand that this service was put in very largely to bring about water competition that might result in a reduction of railroad rates to these points.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. And there is no other boat line

between these points except this one.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman read the amendment?

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman explain to us what the

effect of this amendment will be?

Mr. BARKLEY. The effect of the amendment will be that if there are any funds in this bill that provide for the operation of a barge line between Baltimore, Md., and New Bern, N. C., they can not be used for that purpose, and the Government would have to go out of business and sell these barges or tie them up somewhere or find some other place where they could be used

Mr. BUTLER. It is contended that there is no money ap-

propriated in this bill for this barge line.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the amendment ought not to be adopted on this bill. We have not the time to go back through the bill to find out whether there is some fund provided for such use.

WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland will not It may be true, as claimed, that the amendment would have no effect on the present effort of the Government, through the War Department and Chief of Engineers, to develop and establish transportation on some of our inland waterways. However, the course of the debate apparently justifies the fears expressed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], that it is in a way an attack upon the present effort of the Government to build up inland water transportation.

Congress gave its consent for the War Department to dispose of the barges and other equipment on the New York State Barge Canal and to return the use of the canal to the State of New York, because that was a State canal, built by the State. Therefore, Congress was justified in directing the War Depart-

ment to release control to the State at its request

Now, the operation on the Mississippi and Black Warrior Rivers is entirely another proposition and relates to interstate This service has been going on for some two or three years and it is true, as the gentleman from Maryland says, that the service has been showing a deficit, but that was due to lack of proper equipment and the cost of interchange of freight on account of the want of adequate terminals at interchange points used by the barge line.

Only a short time ago in the sundry civil bill we provided an appropriation for \$1,225,000 for the construction of terminals and for the cooperation by the Government with various points along the Mississippi and Warrior Rivers in order that terminal facilities may be provided which would make the service

a success.

It was shown that 40 per cent of every dollar paid for freight on the barge lines was expended for transfer on account of inadequate terminals. I have in my possession a report made in the last month showing that on the Mississippi-Warrior River service there has been a net return of \$50,000 to the Government.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And a reduction of freight rate amount-

ing to 20 per cent.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; a reduction of freight rates all down the This is probably the last opportunity we may have for a proper demonstration showing this service to be a practical business proposition. We have appropriated about \$10,000,000 in all—the last appropriation was \$4,000,000 and an additional \$1,225,000—for the construction of terminals. The city of Memphis has made provision for \$500,000 to be spent in connection with the Government for terminals in that city. St. Louis \$250,000, and other cities in large amounts. I think it very unfortunate at this period of development of that great service that anything should come up in the House that can be con-

strued as an effort or desire to destroy it, as the debate on this amendment indicates

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WILSON. I will.
Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think the business interests should have brought this matter before our committee? Mr. WILSON. That would have been the proper way

Mr. BLANTON. Instead of bringing it here on the floor by

an amendment

Mr. WILSON. Yes. The waterways are our only hope of relieving the very exorbitant freight charges the people in this country are paying. We are going to be forced to utilize these waterways, and I think Congress should be very cautious about adopting any amendment that might be construed as an indirect attack on the present efforts of the War Department under the authority granted by Congress.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.
Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman says that the Warrior
River is making money. I hope the bookkeeping is better than is shown in this report. This shows that there was a net income of \$2,332, when as a matter of fact they added the debit and the credit together and called it net income, when really there is a deficit of \$1,999,000.

Mr. WILSON. I know that the last report sent out by the War Department shows a surplus on the Mississippi-Warrior

Mr. LINTHICUM. This is from the Inland Waterways Service.

Mr. WILSON. When was that report made?

Mr. LINTHICUM. In 1920, and the bookkeeping will show

that there was a deficit of \$1,999,000.

Oh, well, I was speaking of the report made in 1921. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This is too important a matter to take any chance upon its adoption at this time. Why place a measure of this magnitude as a rider on an appropriation bill? If the amendment is legal and is not subject to a point of order, at least it is not expedient. It is inimical to the best interests of this country. Permanent revival of business and commerce depends upon the development of water transportation. Prosperity can not come back to us in full measure and to stay unless we develop our waterways. In my judgment, the business prosperity of one year ago would be with us to-day and would have continued into the to-morrows of the coming months, and perhaps years, if it had not been for the break-down of our railroads and other existing methods of transportation. We must relieve our railroads when they are carrying the "peak load." How can that be done save by the sane development of the water highways? Mr. Chairman, I shall have more to say upon this subject at a future time. Committee of the Whole House will vote this amendment down and not thus delay the adoption by Congress of a progressive program for the development of water transportation that will mean a permanent solution for the exasperating problem of inadequate transportation that now confronts the country and which has resulted in business and commercial stagnation,

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I very much wish I had a little more time, because statements have been made in relation to this matter which are unintentionally incorrect. Impressions have been made by these statements that are damaging and greatly inac-curate. This line of barge transportation on the line between New Bern and Baltimore is yet incomplete. I have on my desk a letter received from the War Department this morning which I have not answered, indicating its incompleteness and touching the proposition of its coanecting at Elizabeth City. There never have been but two boats on the line; and the statement of the gentleman from Maryland that there have been great losses involved in the various lines referred to by him can have

no direct application to this line.

Now I want to give you the reason for its origin.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to say to the gentleman— Mr. WARD of North Carolina. I can not yield to the gentle-

man; I have not the time.

There are two classes of railroad traffic rates authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission; one where a road parallels a water line, and another where there is no water-line competition. The latter, of course, is much higher, or was in the instance to which I refer. So complete was the absence of any water-line competition along the whole 200 miles betwee

New Bern and Norfolk, Va., that the Norfolk Southern Railroad Co., a road that runs parallel to the coast between Norfolk and New Bern, proposed and gave notice to raise its rates from the lower to the higher rate. The rate, already oppressive, was about to be raised until it would cost a farmer about \$4, I think, to ship a bale of cotton over this road for a distance of from 150 to 200 miles. To meet this emergency and to avoid this great oppression the War Department was appealed to and a line of barges put on from New Bern to Baltimore, touching in the beginning at only one intermediate point before reaching Norfolk, to wit, the town of Washington, where I live. It is proposed that this line touch all other intermediate points, especially Elizabeth City, and this matter, as I have just stated, is pending with the department. The War Department therefore established this line upon the petition of these towns to avoid the excessive rates of transportation which the business could not stand. It is now in its incipiency. I beg of you gentlemen not to destroy it before it is fully born. I ask you gentlemen to let it go until we can see what the loss is, if there are I do not doubt it up to now, but there is no development there yet. At my own town they have not been stopping over 30 days, and expensive wharf investments have been made in contemplation of its development. They are shut out at New Bern and these intermediate points, although the water stretches all the way between New Bern and Norfolk, and at the mercy of one railroad company that has neither private water competition nor bowels of compassion, and the extraordinary condition exists of the United States Government owning a canal with both ends open and the middle closed up. extraordinary condition exists there, and they are shut off and at the mercy of the railroad that is threatening to raise their I am advised that the rate on a horse from Norfolk to Elizabeth City, a distance of 40 miles, is \$3. They can not get out of the inlets and go on the ocean because of the dangers of the shoals of Hatteras. Gentlemen, I ask you, I appeal to you, not to destroy this wholesome project, given by the mercies

of the Government, before it is fully born. [Applause.]
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired;
all time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment of the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes

appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HILL) there were—ayes 3, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, strike out line 12, after the word "further" and down to and including the word "automobiles," in line 21, and insert in place thereof the following: "That the Secretary of War is authorized and

directed to sell forthwith at public auction or private sale all motor trucks, passenger-carrying automobiles, motor cycles, and trailers now in the possession of the War Department in excess of the requirements of an army of the strength provided for in this act, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, or does the gentleman-

Mr. ANTHONY. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee make the point of order?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for two years more or less I have been following the subject of the disposition of motor vehicles, and I think the country has followed the proposition without arriving anywhere. number of motor vehicles purchased by the War Department was 217,447. We shipped abroad 118,900. There remained in the United States October 23, 1919, 108,547 motor vehicles which the Motor Transport Corps had cognizance of. Afterwards they discovered that there were 2,000 which the Ordnance Department had which they had not accounted for, which made, April 1, 1920, 111,766 motor vehicles. We have under various acts provided for the distribution of motor vehicles to various departments of the Government. We have distributed to the Department of Agriculture for distribution to the States, in part, up to November 16, 1920, 26,285 motor vehicles. We have given to the Public Health Service 1,400; to the Post Office Department, 9,000; to the Vocational Training Department, 2,000; and sold to the public unserviceable vehicles to the extent of 12,000. Now, this bill provides that the Secretary of War shall have power to sell or dispose of by transfer—which continues the old proposition of transfer—10,000 motor trucks and 2,000 passenger-carrying automobiles. On the basis of an Army of 150,000 men there are no passenger-carrying vehicles left. In fact, there is a deficiency of 207. Upon this basis of 150,000 men the Army officials figure on 4,245 passenger-carrying vehicles, 19,612 trucks, 4,218 trailers, and 5,058 motor cycles. I think instead of permitting any more distribution to already overburdened States by the Agricultural Department that these motor vehicles should be sold and the money placed in the Treasury. It costs for operation of a motor vehicle, on the basis of the Government operation in the Army at present, \$830 a year. It costs the States of the United States to operate motor vehicles turned over to the highway departments some \$20,000,000 a year. We gave these motor vehicles to the States upon the theory that they would be retained by the States. I am credibly informed that the State of New Jersey has recently sold eight Pierce-Arrow trucks for \$390 each, which they received from the Government, and which the purchaser said he would have paid for at Camp Holabird a thousand dollars apiece. I insert a statement as to motor-vehicle status as of April 23, 1921:

Type.	Total vehicles.						1	in storage.		77	Issued to troops.				
		Condition.		Storage.		\$, 1	Condition.		Storage.			Condition.		Storage.	
	Total.	Service- Unserviceable.	Open.	Closed.	Total.	Service- able.	Unserv- iceable.	Open.	Closed.	Total.	Service- able.	Unserv- iceable.	Open.	Closed.	
Passenger Trucks. Trailers Motor cycles Ambulances Special design.	4, 378 31, 439 14, 784 9, 063 2, 445 1, 320	2, 552 23, 812 14, 534 6, 528 1, 818 1, 077	1, 826 7, 627 250 2, 535 627 243	954 6, 721 836 776 463 256	3, 424 24, 718 13, 948 8, 287 1, 982 1, 064	1, 363 12, 891 12, 147 2, 609 1, 303 437	103 9,252 12,064 1,409 804 236	1, 260 3, 639 83 1, 200 499 201	954 2, 769 773 178 403 116	409 10, 122 11, 374 2, 431 900 321	3, 015 18, 548 2, 637 6, 454 1, 142 883	2, 449 14, 560 2, 470 5, 119 1, 014 841	566 3,988 167 1,337 128 42	0 3, 952 63 598 60 140	3, 013 14, 596 2, 574 5, 856 1, 083 743
aeon en militaria de la composición dela composición dela composición de la composición dela composición de la composición dela composición de la composición de la composición dela composición de la composición del composición del composición del composición del composición del composición dela composición dela composición del composición del composición del composición	63, 429	50, 321	13, 108	10,006	53, 423	30, 750	23, 868	6, 882	5, 193	25, 557	32, 679	26, 453	6, 226	4, 813	27, 86

The above figures should be reduced as indicated below:

	Surplus not yet disposed.	Authorized for National Guard; not yet delivered.	Aggregate.	Total vehicles.	Balance after deduction.	Authorized retention, Army 150,000.	Estimated additional surplus.	Estimated deficit.
Passenger Trucks Trailers Motor cycles Ambulances Special design	105 4,367 7,804 2,553 0 0	235 912 358 1,162 397 0	340 5,279 8,162 3,715 397 0	4,378 31,439 14,784 9,063 2,445 1,320	4,038 26,160 6,622 5,348 2,048 1,320	4, 245 19, 652 4, 218 5, 058 2, 048 1, 320	6,508 2,404 290 0	207
	14, 829	3,064	17, 893	63, 429	45, 536	36, 541	9, 202	207

The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ANTHONY. order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. ANTHONY. The bill has a provision permitting the War Department to sell a specific number of vehicles. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would base the number to be sold upon a certain size of the Army, and it would be so indefinite there is no probability any would be sold, because they might decide they needed the entire amount.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Upon that theory, Mr. Chairman, the War Department has already fixed the basis of retention, and I have before me a statement of the War Department which has been furnished to me stating the number that is to be used upon a basis of 150,000 men.

Mr. ANTHONY. And the amendment also amends the exist-

ing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the paragraph itself is legislation and clearly subject to a point of order, so the question of germaneness could not be raised.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May we have the amendment

again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman-

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know that I care personally to press the point of order, but I think it is subject

Will the gentleman state his reasons? The CHAIRMAN.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It broadens the kind of vehicles that are dealt with. The only two characters of vehicle mentioned are motor trucks and passenger-carrying automobiles. The gentleman's amendment carries in addition trailers and motor cycles, I think-another class. It seems to me that that so broadens the amendment as to destroy its germaneness

The CHAIRMAN. There are at least two classes provided for in the paragraph as it stands, and the amendment adds other classes. Does not the gentleman think that under the

practice of the House that can be done?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I know there are precedents, of course—that where two public buildings, for instance, are provided there can be more provided for. Whether that is exactly analogous to this case or not I do not know.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order

that the gentleman's point of order comes too late, for the reason that he did not either make or reserve the point of order on the paragraph but only reserved the point of order against the amendment, and the paragraph itself contains legislation and therefore is subject to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is assum-

ing that this is legislation and is discussing the question as to

germaneness, which is perfectly proper.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair did not get my point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman thoroughly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a

Mr. BLANTON.

Mr. BLANTON. As to the paragraph? Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As to the amendment. Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the part of the bill to which this amendment is offered is

clearly legislation of itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has so stated.

Mr. BLANTON. And that no point of order having been made to that, it comes too late now to make a point of order against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of germaneness can be raised now, and that is what the point of order raises; and the only question raised is a question of germaneness to the legislation proposed to be carried in this paragraph. The gentleman from Tennessee is right.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will say very frankly that at the time the amendment was offered I overlooked the fact that there was in the provision carried in the bill an authorization and direction to sell. I was under the impression it was an authorization and direction merely to transfer to other departments. Had that been correct, manifestly, a direction to sell would not be in order. Of course, there are precedents that have been suggested, one as to where two proposi- by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Sanders], that the vice of

tions are contained; others may be added. But I have considerable doubt as to whether that would apply to a situation of this sort

Mr. WALSH. 'Will the gentleman yield? Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman notice the item in the bill as to the authority and direction to sell under existing

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I had supposed by reason of the punctuation that it meant a transfer under existing law, and that the word "sell" is not involved in existing law. In other words, I notice there is a comma after "sell" and a comma after "law." So it seems to me that the provision of existing law would apply only to the transfer to other departments. Personally, I do not care to press the point of order.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on

the point of order?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. For just one suggestion. think when you come to consider the question of an amendment to legislation permitted to be left in an appropriation bill. the rule as to germaneness is a different rule from the rule when you are considering the question as to general legislation. I have not the authority just now, but there is a precedent which seems to me the clearest and most logical one on the subject. The decision holds that while you may amend legislative matter which is illegal under the rules if a point of order is made, still you can not offer an amendment which amounts to an added illegality. You can not increase the illegality. Now, this legislation here authorizes the selling of a certain sort of vehicle. I have no doubt that, inasmuch as we permitted the legislation to go in, the committee would have the right to amend that and to say how we would sell it, how many we ought to sell, or make it a less number than those enumerated, or to say we could sell them in some sections and not in others. But to say that because the committee includes legislation to permit certain vehicles to go in, that on the floor of the House we should permit the sale of other vehicles, like motor cycles, is stretching the matter too far. A decision was made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Burron] years ago, in which he reviewed, as Chairman, some of the holdings with reference to points of order made to amendments to legislative matters put in an appropriation bill. And he laid down what seemed to me to be the most logical rule, and that is that it is not merely a question of whether it shall be germane, but the question is whether it is an added illegality, and if it is it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, following the line of argument suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Sanders], I recall that some years ago-and perhaps it may refresh the memory of the present occupant of the chair—a bill being under consideration in the Committee of the Whole providing for several designated kinds of articles and an amendment being offered that was generic in similarity, and yet, if I recall correctly, the Chair held that that was not germane to the bill or

the item then under consideration. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the citation instanced by the Chair of a bill in which two States are

admitted is not akin to the one under consideration.

Although I am in sympathy with the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR] and believe that trucks and passenger-carrying automobiles and motor cycles not required for the Army ought to be sold, nevertheless, for the sake of consistency with legislative precedents, I think the Chair can not say that just because there are precedents, that where in a bill two States are admitted it is in order to provide for the admission of an additional State, it would be in order to provide for the sale of an additional character of vehicle, as in this case. There the subject matter is a State, but here we are considering something different from that the committee has reported, namely, the sale and distribution of trucks and passenger-carrying automobiles. It is not the case, if the Chair please, of a general law being open for amendment, whereby you can present any germane amendment of the same class.

This paragraph must be considered as if a bill were brought into this House containing but this paragraph. The committee then would have considered the subject matter of two items, namely, motor trucks and passenger-carrying automobiles. It would not have been in order, if such a bill had been reported to this House for consideration in the House or in Committee of the Whole, to have added different kinds of vehicles, horse drawn, motor cycles, or even airships, although the latter might be an exaggerated instance. Still it would be a vehicle of transportation. I respectfully contend that the position taken the gentleman's amendment is in adding two other kinds of vehicles to that which is included in the amendment under consideration, fails because it is in violation of the rule of germaneness

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have that de-

It is contained in Fourth Hinds, 3836. cision

The CHAIRMAN. The decision referred to by the gentle-man is before the Chair. The pending Army appropriation bill contains a paragraph beginning on line 12 of page 33 which is clearly legislation, but to which the point of order was not made. Therefore, for the purpose of deciding this point of order, we may consider this paragraph as it stands as a bill being considered by the House. The paragraph provides

That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell, or to dispose of by transfer to the Department of Agriculture under existing laws, for its own use and the use of the several States in road work and maintenance of roads, not less than one-half by sale, so many motor trucks and passenger-carrying automobiles as will, in addition to such trucks and automobiles as have been sold or transferred since January 1, 1921, aggregate during the first six months of the calendar year 10,000 motor trucks and 2,000 passenger-carrying automobiles.

To this the gentleman from New York [Mr. MacGregor] offers an amendment providing that the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell forthwith at public auction or private sale, all motor trucks, passenger-carrying automobiles, motor cycles, and trailers now in the possession of the War Department, and so on. Against this amendment a point of order is made upon the ground that it is not germane to the original

paragraph.

What is the subject of the original paragraph? To dispose of automotive vehicles, enumerating motor trucks and passenger automobiles; to dispose of them, first, by sale, and second, by transfer to the Department of Agriculture. It is clear that if the committee wished to do so it could strike out this part of the paragraph, "or by transfer to the Department of Agriculture," so that it would leave only the authority to sell. It is clear that the committee would have power to change the method of sale, and this the amendment attempts to do.

It is contended, however, that in the language, "motor cycles and trailers," which is different from the language carried in the original paragraph, the scope is so widened as to render

the amendment not germane.

Upon an examination of the language it seems that there is only this difference: The original paragraph provided for motor trucks and passenger-carrying automobiles. The proposed amendment carries motor trucks, passenger-carrying automobiles, motor cycles, and trailers. It seems to the Chair that this change is not of such a character as to render the amendment not germane to the original paragraph. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is not much more that I desire to say.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins on that question I would like to ask him a question for information.

Certainly. Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Can the gentleman inform the committee how many trucks and motor cycles have been transferred to the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the existing law?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Twenty-six thousand two hundred and

eighty-five motor vehicles.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is that the limit? Is that all that can be transferred under the terms of existing law?

Mr. MacGREGOR. No. As I understand it, under existing law they can take any motor vehicles on which they can lay their hands.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, one effect of the gentleman's amendment, if it were adopted, would be to stop all transfers to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Yes. That, Mr. Chairman, I believe is wise. I appreciate the desire on the part of the highways departments of States to get a They are always willing to take something for nothing. Take my own State of New York. Here we have already pretty nearly 1,200 motor vehicles-20 to a county-and what in the world they are doing with them I do not know. I asked the commissioner of highways of the State of New York whether they needed any more, and he wrote me a letter in which he said they did not need any motor vehicles. Yet notwithstanding that the auditor of the highway department telegraphed or wrote down here for something like 61 more motor vehicles. I wrote to the Secretary of War in reference to the know how they got the word-the Public Roads Department down here telegraphed out to all the States and asked them whether they did not want any more motor vehicles. Of course, they came piling in here saying that they wanted more motor

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I remember, the State of New York adopted the policy of asking Federal cooperation. It relies entirely on the State funds, but asks Federal cooperation.

Mr. MacGREGOR. It does not ask any Federal coopera-tion. I think that is the condition.

As I stated before, according to the statistics of the War Department, the operation of an automobile costs \$830 a year. The respective States are clamorously insisting that they want to cut down their State budgets, but their highway departments are asking for more motor vehicles and this puts upon them a larger expense for the operation of motor vehicles. stance, in the State of New York it would mean over \$1,000,000 for operation of motor vehicles. I thought I had the number of passenger-carrying motor vehicles for New York, but I notice at least 135 Fords for the State. The same situation runs all through, and I think it is a burden that the people of the State ought to be relieved of.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Does not the amendment of the gentleman authorize the Secretary of War to dispose of these vehicles?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Yes; but it also takes out of the bill the

provision with reference to transfer to the departments.

Mr. FESS. Is the gentleman under the same suspicion that I am that there is pressure not to dispose of them in order that

some other department may get them?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Yes; there is always pressure in more than one direction. There is pressure from the automobile than one direction. There is pressure from the automobile manufacturers and there is pressure from these department heads down here and there is pressure from the outside-pressure from the various States.

Mr. FESS. I am not in possession of the facts, but I entertain that very strong suspicion, and I am inclined to vote with the gentleman for his amendment, although I do not have the facts. We criticized the recent administration very severely, and I would like to be consistent. If we are not disposing of these vehicles, and there is any reason why we are not, we ought in some way or other to remove that reason.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Certainly.
Mr. LANHAM. Can the gentleman inform us how many vehicles of these various classes would be disposed of and put upon the market if his amendment were adopted?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Does the gentleman mean to ask me to

separate them?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; how many automobile trucks, how many trailers, how many passenger-carrying vehicles, how many motor cycles?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Assuming that there are on hand only sufficient number for an army of 150,000, there are no passenger-carrying motor vehicles left.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MacGREGOR. May I have two minutes more? I would like to answer the question, if I can.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York have three minutes more. I want to ask him a question or two.

Mr. ANTHONY. How much time does the gentleman want? Mr. MacGREGOR. Three minutes.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I will be glad to listen to the gentleman's question as soon as I have answered the question of the gentleman from Texas. There would be available 10,875 trucks, 10,208 trailers, and 2,843 motor cycles.

Mr. LANHAM. Has the gentleman any information as to the

number of cars of different makes?

Mr. MacGREGOR. No; not of those retained. I have the figures as to those already distributed to the departments.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. The gentleman stated, I believe, that

it would cost \$20,000,000 to run these extra automobiles. Has matter of selling motor vehicles, and the Secretary of War agreed with me on the proposition, but immediately—I do not harmful to the road service than helpful to it to have these automobiles and that it leads to extravagance? Is that the

gentleman's contention?

Mr. MacGREGOR. My contention is that it leads to extrava-gance, because there is a tendency on the part of the highway commissioners to ask the Government to turn over more vehicles than are absolutely necessary for road-building purposes.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. And the upkeep is very expensive? Mr. MacGREGOR. The upkeep is very extravagant. Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. MacGregor] seeks to accomplish, and that is to force the War Department to dispose of these unnecessary trucks and automobiles, but the objection to the gentleman's amendment is its indefiniteness. I fear that under the wording of the amendment the War Department might construe that it needed every truck and every automobile it has on hand for an Army of 150,000 men. There is no fixed number of motorpropelled vehicles that goes with an Army of any size, and if the War Department desires to retain every truck and every automobile that they have on hand they can do so under the amendment of the gentleman from New York. Therefore I think there should be some fixed number ordered to be disposed of if we desire to accomplish any results. A vast number of vehicles have been disposed of by the War Department. There now remain on hand, according to the latest reports, a total of 30,000 vehicles. Of this number, 10,088 are designed for the equipment of tactical units, and 12,800 are at posts in camps in operation. The War Department is holding 7,074 for replacement or maintenance. Now, there are other thousands of trucks that have been disposed of in various ways that are still at the service of the department if it needs them. For instance, it announced that it was its intention to assign 6,000 trucks to the National Guard. The National Guard does not need any such number as that, and it would be an added expense if we had to maintain that number in the hands of the guard. think there are about 3,000 now in the hands of the guard, twice as many as are necessary, so that I think we can safely dispose of 10,000 of these vehicles and still leave plenty of them for any possible use of the War Department.

I agree with the opinion expressed here that it is unwise to allow the Department of Agriculture to distribute any more Many of the States have more of these of these vehicles. trucks and automobiles than they know what to do with. Some counties have 30 or 40, for which they have no use. are just rusting away, standing out in the open air all over the United States, and many counties are selling them and converting them into cash. This money ought to go into the Federal Treasury. So on account of its indefiniteness I oppose this

amendment.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman opposes the recommendation that 6,000 be given to the National Guard. Will the gentleman state, also, if they do not need that number, that it rather reassures our suspicion that we have not definite information, and that we are not safe in acting on the recommendation of the authorities in charge of the War Department? What I want to know is, can not we as a Congress take the bull by the horns and dispose of this surplus?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is what we are trying to do, and I think it is safe to order them to dispose of 10,000. I think the amendment could be further improved if they are ordered sold and none distributed through the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman knows that there is intense feeling among members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and that we had criticism without limit in the last administration. I am wondering whether we are doing any better now. I think we ought to be consistent, and do this even if we have to use the meat ax.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. McKENZIE. I desire to ask the gentleman from Kansas if he is not going too far in this amendment in saying how many trucks shall be disposed of in view of the fact that we have five different centers in this country under the War Department whose only activity is the repairing of automobiles and trucks? If the gentleman gets the number down too low, does he not think that there will not be much for these repair shops to do?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am afraid that it will put some of those

establishments out of business

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 20, strike out "ten" and insert in lieu thereof "fif-teen"; strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "ten."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, as usual, I am with the committee chairman. I am against the amendment of the gen-

tleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR] only for one reason, and that is he leaves it to the discretion of the War Department, and if that is done there will not be a single automobile or truck sold. Because it has been the continuing policy of the War Department not to sell against the express wish of Members on both sides of the aisle for over two years. I am glad to hear the committee chairman say that he is in favor of the purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from New York and that he believes that these automobiles ought to be sold or disposed of, and I am offering an amendment that will make them sell and dispose of them. Even if we get them into the hands of the Agricultural Department it is not going to be hog tied like the War Department has been for two years, with an agreement we all understand was made with the automobile manufacturers that they would not put these new vehicles on the market.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I can not yield; the gentleman has had 10 minutes and I have not had any.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has had half an hour. Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] when he was here last had enough time to last him four years more. I am glad to see him take time, however, because he studies the question and I get information from him. We are glad that he is back on the floor again, because we all get lots of information from him.

Now, I want to say that right after the armistice was signed I went to San Antonio, Tex., and I saw new automobile after automobile rusting away, exposed to the weather. They were not discarded ones which they condemn and sell after they are worn out. They were new ones. They have not sold a new automobile since the armistice, and have only sold those condemned, that nobody would have. But there were dozens of new cars there that never had been used, and they let them sit out in the weather, in the mud, deteriorating, rusting, and spoiling. I saw at San Antonio new cars, new Cadillacs, out there in the mud without any cover over them. I went back there a year later and the very same identical automobiles were still standing there in the mud. Why did not they sell them? Merely to protect the automobile manufacturers, and against the interests of the people. I want to say that if they made any such agreement with the automobile manufacturers and I said the same thing under the Democratic administration—they were acting like fools. It was against the interest of the people. Now, they have held all over the United States thousands of these cars long enough, and they still have thousands of them, and I am in sympathy with the purpose of the committee's provision and the purpose of the gentleman from New York in putting in his amendment and in putting the bill in such shape by my own amendment that the War Department will be compelled to dispose of these cars. If we can get them into the hands of the Department of Agriculture, if it can not use them on the public roads, it will have the right to sell or dispose of them. What I want to do is to take it wholly out They have made a botch of of the War Department's hands. the business, and I want some Government agency to have a chance at it and see if they can not get these automobiles back into the avenues of trade, where the people of the United States can get some benefit from them.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think that there is considerable truth in what the gentleman from Texas says. If we intend to get the motor vehicles out of the War Department's hands we had better legislate. believe the gentleman from Ohio expressed my views when he said that Congress ought to take the matter into its own hands now. For four months I have been trying to get a light Dodge truck assigned to the Bureau of Mines in my district. We have a rescue training school and station there at Vincennes, Ind. They need a light truck and need it so badly that the Bureau of Mines will have to buy it, and as I say for four months I have been trying to get one of these trucks assigned

to this station.

The Government admits that it has thousands of them, but there is some red tape or something in the way so that there is no power on earth that can get one of these trucks assigned I recently had a letter from the War Department to a station. I recently had a letter from the War Department saying that the knew of no way that the Agricultural Department could permit the Bureau of Mines to have this truck, even if the Agricultural Department had one of them. If legislation is at fault, then we are at fault. There ough: to be some means whereby the different departments at least could get the trucks they need.

Not long ago attention was called to the Agricultural Committee that the Agricultural Department was paying something like \$3,000 for a truck to send up to New Jersey to use for the extermination of Japanese beetles. This followed close upon the distribution by the Agricultural Department of 100 trucks to the State of New Jersey. The Agricultural Department said that they could not change the order; that the New Jersey road department had the trucks but they would not give them over to the Agricultural Department, and therefore they would have to buy one and send it up there. It seems to me that the Government has ceased to function in connection with the proper exchange of these trucks. Are we going to permit the Agricultural Department and Bureau of Mines to buy new trucks when there are plenty of them at different camps in our country?

Is Congress going to say that it is helpless, fold its hands, and not give some kind of legislation that will relieve this distressing condition? Now I have given up any hope of getting a light truck for the Bureau of Mines without buying it with money appropriated by this Congress. It is the only way I know of, and I have worked on the proposition for four months, but the Secretary of War can tell me no way and the Secretary of Agriculture can tell me of no way of getting it, and the Bureau of Mines say "we are helpless in the matter and your truck can not be obtained."

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I will.

Mr. BLACK. I can suggest a way for the gentleman. If he will just offer an amendment directing the Secretary of War to transfer one of these trucks to the Bureau of Mines and the

point of order is not made to it, the Bureau of Mines will get it.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. But the gentleman has several
"ifs" in his statement. There are no doubt a number of
Members who will make the point of order here. We have never been able to get legislation through this or the preceding Congress that will take care of this truck situation. I do not know why, and I would like to ask the chairman of this committee if there is any provision of this bill whereby the Bureau ef Mines can get one of these many thousands of trucks?

Mr. BLANTON. I suggest the gentleman suspend asking the

question awhile until the chairman gets back.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I wish he were here. I would like

to direct that inquiry to him when he returns.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

Upon a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there wereayes 17, noes 39.

So the amendment was rejected. The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment

offered by the gentleman— Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, before the question is put I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.]

The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I stated in the gentleman's absence that I find it impossible, after working four months, to find any law or authority that entitled the Secretary of War or the Secretaries of Agriculture or Interior or the Burean of Mines to get the transfer of a truck from the War Department to the station at Vincennes of a light Dodge truck, although they have many thousands of them. Is there any provision in this bill whereby that condition may be remedied, and whereby this Bureau of Mines can obtain one of the Government-owned trucks without buying a new one?

Mr. ANTHONY. They have authority now under the law to transfer such a vehicle if it is declared surplus. The trouble with the War Department is that it refuses to declare these

vehicles surplus.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I have their letter saying it has to be declared nonserviceable.

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Any automobile transferred to the Agriculture Department has to be declared surplus before it gets there, but after it gets there the Agricultural Department has no power to transfer the truck to the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. ANTHONY. The Bureau of Mines would have to pay

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Certainly. Either go out in the market and buy it, not buy it of the War Department, because they sent the Bureau of Mine's representative to New Albany, as they did the other day, and buy one of these tracks, and when they went to great expense and arrived there they found they were selling about 100 trucks of this make of cars, but they were out of service, condemned, perfectly worthless. They went over to New Jersey, and the same kind of condition ob-

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to add to the observations which have been made here in reference to the handling of these surplus vehicles by the War Department. All over the country it is well understood that these vehicles have been stored out in the weather and permitted to deteriorate. They would not sell them. Now, I want to ask the chairman of this subcommittee if it is not possible in this bill or by some other legislation, in view of the fact that the War Department will not declare a surplus, for the Congress of the United States to institute some kind of an independent agency to do this thing? It is a national disgrace. The country knows and everybody knows that great depots have been established where these vehicles that have cost a tremendous amount of public funds have been permitted to deteriorate. People could not buy them. I think a thing of this sort ought to address itself to the determined purpose of the Congress to correct. That sort of thing has the worst possible effect upon the morale of the people of the country in respect to their confidence in the integrity of the public officials and of the Government, and I ask the chairman of this committee if it is not possible for the Congress, either in this bill or some other legislation, to remedy this matter, and do it now?

Mr. ANTHONY. It should be. Of course, that is a matter that should probably be brought forth by the legislative committee having that in charge. We tried to precipitate such action by putting an amendment in our Army appropriation bill. The House very generously allowed it to stay in the bill. The provision in force is the one agreed upon in conference, and in my opinion it should be further amended by striking out this transfer to the Department of Agriculture and surplus vehicles should be sold.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. There is another feature about this matter. I was in one of the national reserves this summer, and the superintendent told me that he very much needed a truck to do some work, and that the State in which that reserve was located had had assigned to it by the Government a number of these trucks, and that they were not in use at all, but were standing out in the weather, and that he could not get the privilege of using this truck. It seems to me, too, the Government should reserve the right to use all equipment donated, and that this surplus property should be shifted from one activity of the Government to the other when needed and not in use where assigned. Any department of the Government within reasonable limitations ought to be able to use Government property in any activity of the Government when the equipment is not otherwise in use. There is too much disposition of each of these departments to regard itself as an entity, as a sort of government of itself and unto itself. It is economically wasteful to have so much equipment assigned to this department and so much to that department, instead of recognizing that equipment is devoted to Government use, and when the Government does not need it at one particular place it ought to be shifted to another department or to another place instead of having a surplus not in use at one place and purchasing new equipment for another department.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I hope nobody will accuse me of partisanship if I inquire in all seriousness when this administration is going to start to function. You will remember that in the last Congress about once or twice a day some of the gentlemen on the Republican side would rear back on their hind feet and cuss out the War Department, and Mr. Baker in particular, because he would not get rid of these surplus trucks. And I see one gentleman sitting over there looking as solemn as an owl that used to indulge in that, but I have not heard him say anything about it since Secretary Weeks exercises the same contumacious stubbornness by not letting these trucks go. If you gentlemen can find some way of changing the leopard's spots of this War Department, we will join you.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bland] is right. It is folly to say that the Bureau of Mines should go out and buy a new truck when to-day in storage there is every kind of truck they need and that the War Department has and does not need, and all on earth that is necessary is to declare it surplus and turn it over to them. And all that is needed in the War Department is horse sense in handling these trucks. I say that in no partisan spirit. Baker was guilty of the same thing and Weeks is guilty of the same thing, and I hope that four years will not go around until we can use some horse sense in disposing of the surplus trucks. The gentleman said they will not let them go unless they are worthless. Is that correct?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. The situation is simply this, that they have no power to dispose of them to the public unless they

are nonserviceable.

Mr. WINGO. That is my information. In other words, when they get ready to sell one of these trucks, it is not worth selling.

It must be "spoiled," just as you say they sold meat that was That was a remarkable statement made on Friday that this administration is selling spoiled meat. Well, it is a serious charge against the War Department that it is selling spoiled meat. Of course, it is not true. You say the Democratic Party is responsible for it. Well, I do not know which is worse, one that would hold the meat until it was spoiled or one that would unload spoiled stuff on the public. If that stuff was spoiled, it ought to have been dumped in the river. It ought not to be put out at any price for American people to eat. Let us get rid of the spoiled meat and the worn-out trucks; get rid of the surplus by letting it go where it ought to go,

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I would like to know what the facts are about these trucks and automobiles. Is it true that we have these thousands of automobiles and trucks that are out in the

weather and deteriorating?

Mr. WYANT. Is it true that the contract to purchase prohibits the Government from selling these trucks in the open

market at public sale?

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman possibly has more information than I have. I have heard that suggestion for two or three years, but I have not found anybody responsible with enough energy to find out whether it is true or not. They said it was true during Baker's time.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Was it true?

Mr. WINGO. I hear my Republican friends still charging it, but whether by force of habit or predicated upon known facts I can not say. Our Republican friends made that charge, and whether the momentum they thus acquired is spent on the pres-

ent Secretary of War I can not say.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I have gone into the truck contracts somewhat, and I have not found any specific provision in any truck contract where the Government is not permitted to sell them on the market. But I have gone far enough to believe that there is an understanding that a truck will not be put on the market until it is worthless

Mr. WINGO. Have you made any headway with the present

General Staff? Mr. BLAND of Indiana. As the gentleman suggested a moment ago, something seems to get into their heads when they get over there which causes them to cease to function for the public. I have not any criticism of Mr. Weeks so far, but if he is not able to afford relief there will be criticism of him.

Mr. WINGO. If you can not get such relief, who can? He is your dog, and you must pick the fleas or quit scratching.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to

strike out the last two words.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I have heard for some time-for a year or two-and all of us have, that there are great numbers of automobiles and trucks that are out in the weather unprotected and being destroyed by the elements-thousands of them. I have never known whether that is true or not. It has always occurred to me if we had these thousands of automobiles there must be some good reason why the department did not dispose Surely the War Department would not keep the automobiles out there just for the fun of seeing them go to pieces and rot and thereby waste the public funds. There must be some good reason for it, if it is a fact.

I would like to ask somebody over there two questions: First, Is it a fact that we have this great number of automobiles and trucks out in the weather and going to ruin; and, if so, what reason does the department assign for it, without reference to whether it is a Democratic administration or Republican administration? I am not particularly interested in that, but I would like to know what the facts are about these automobiles.

Mr. ANTHONY. The facts are as the gentleman states. I think it is safe to say that at two depots in this country there are still automobiles in the original packing boxes, standing out in the open air. The only reason which is apparent to me as to why they have not been sold is based upon some kind of an understanding which it is said was had between the War Department and the manufacturers to not depress the industry. My experience here has been that every time I have introduced an amendment to sell automobiles or trucks-and on the last fortification bill I introduced an amendment to sell a number of tractors-great pressure was brought to bear, not only in this body, but more noticeably in the other body, to have those distributed through the Agricultural Department so as not to depress the price of the product.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is there any objection on the part of these manufacturers, who seem to dominate the situation, to

having these automobiles used by the Government in other departments?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think they are agreeable to any system that will keep them off the market. They do not object to loading down any department of the Government. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. As I understand, further, there is need of these automobiles in other departments of the Government. Now, why is it that they have not been transferred to those departments? Has the War Department no authority to do it

Mr. ANTHONY. I think they have that authority.
Mr. HUMPHREYS. But they decline to turn them over to
the other departments?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. Mr. BLAND of Indiana. The gentleman says they have that authority. I would like to see that authority. I doubt it.

Mr. ANTHONY. They have authority to turn them over to

the Department of Agriculture and to the Post Office Department.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. And there it stops.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is there any objection to turning them over to other departments that need them?

Mr. ANTHONY. The only objection is that all the other departments are overloaded now, as I understand.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have an amend-

ment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALSH). The Clerk will report the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. My amendment reads as follows: Page 34, at the end of line 10, insert the following-

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there is an amendment already pending.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary in-

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will it be in order when the other amendment is disposed of to offer that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. A division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SNELL: Mr. Chairman, can we not have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR] will again be reported.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana whether the amendment he proposes to offer is an amendment similar to that of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. No. It is a separate amendment, covering a different territory.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to withdraw my

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment,

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, that can not be done under the circumstances. I make the point of order that the House was dividing on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. It can be done by unanimous con-

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my amendment and offer in lieu thereof a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN, The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment and offer a substitute. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, if it is an amendment that is in order, that can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair knows nothing about that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let us have it read for infor-

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Mac-GREGOR] asks unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment and to offer in lieu thereof another amendment, which the Clerk will read for information.

The Clerk read as fellows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. MacGregon: Page 33, line 13, strike out after the word "sell" all the balance of the line and lines 14, 15, and 16, down to and including the word "sale," in line 16, so that the paragraph will read, "That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell so many motor trucks and passenger-carrying automobiles," and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MacGregor: Page 33, line 13, strike out after the word "sell" all the balance of the line and lines 14, 15, and 16, down to and including the word "sale," in line 16.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I think that amendment is satisfactory

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I raise my

voice against that amendment. The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr.

MACGREGOR] desire to discuss his amendment?

Mr. MacGREGOR. No. I have no further discussion to

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recog-

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have watched the disposition here with this House sitting in committee to say, rather than the Secretary of War and the War Department, as to what goods they shall keep on hand and what goods they shall sell. I respectfully protest that this House has no information as to what stock of automobiles should be kept on hand, not, perhaps, for the present Army, but in case of an emergency.

I desire likewise to say that it seems to be assumed in this

House that an automobile, if left out in the open air, is spoiled in a short time. I went down to Panama in 1904 and I found locomotives-small locomotives-and machinery of all kinds that had stood in the open air in that damp climate for years, and when they came to use them again it was only a question of wiping off a little rust. They were not destroyed. Automobiles are made to stand the weather, and they do not deteriorate in the way that has been suggested.

But the point I wish to emphasize is that it is the business of the Secretary of War and of the War Department to determine what stock of arms and transportation facilities should be kept on hand for the needs of this Government, and it is not the right or the duty of this House to determine that question for the Secretary of War or to decide whether he should sell or not.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes.
Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think that we should either sell the automobiles or make an appropriation for

a corps of wipers?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The gentleman is asking a question that I suppose is meant to be a little bit of a joke. I say that as to the amount of stock kept on hand it is a great deal cheaper to keep them than to sell it for nothing. great deal cheaper to keep than to buy again, and it is a great deal cheaper in case of necessity to have on hand the necessary war material than to have disposed of it. But what I insist on is that the Congress of the United States knows nothing on this subject, and the War Department ought to be trusted more than it seems to be the disposition on the part of the House to trust it.

Mr. WYANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. WYANT. Does not the gentleman know that there are acres of these trucks and automobiles out on the swamp decaying?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jer-

sey has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recog-

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire sympathy with the manifest disposition here to require the sale of these automobiles.

I have not very much information about it, but I assume that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which brought in this bill gave attention to this proposition and determined from the information before them that it would be safe to direct the sale to the extent provided, to wit, 10,000 motor trucks and 2,000 passenger-carrying automobiles, and I am following the committee, because I assume that the com-

mittee know more about it than I do. I should have been glad to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Texas increasing the number which would be sold if I had been certain that we had sufficient information before us to know that that would be a safe thing to do.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. If I understand the amendment of the gentleman from New York it will require the War Department to sell rather than transfer to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am just coming to that proposition. I do not know whether it is a wise thing virtually to repeal law which now authorizes transfers to the Agricultural Department or not, if his amendment will do that. I have no information as to the status of these transfers. I want to vote intelligently upon this matter.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think I can give the gentleman some information. The amendment of the gentleman from New York would compel the department to sell 10,000 trucks and 2,000 automobiles between January 1, 1921, and six months thereafter. Now, the figures show that between January 1, 1921, and March 31, 1921, they disposed of 3,354 vehicles, so under the language of the amendment as in now stands it will only force them to sell about 8,700 more vehicles, and there are 30,000 remaining.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The provision of the com-

mittee's bill will do that, will it not?

Mr. ANTHONY. Our bill would have required them either to sell them or to transfer them. The amendment of the gentleman from New York strikes out the transfer requirement.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman from Kansas understand that it would virtually repeal the existing law authorizing the transfer? Am I correct in that, or could they still transfer?

Mr. ANTHONY. It would not repeal any existing law. Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. They could still transfer

vehicles to the Department of Agriculture, could they?

Mr. ANTHONY. If they were declared surplus.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Who declares them surplus?

Mr. ANTHONY. The General Staff.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Is there any way in which we can put through a proposition here that will prevent the War Department transferring automobiles to the Agricultural Department in such a way that they do not go to the public? If we leave it to them, they will transfer to the Agricultural Department, will they not?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think they will.
Mr. McKENZIE. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this amendment is possibly more important than we might think at first blush. It involves, as was said by the gentleman from New Jersey, the question of having Congress undertake to determine the amount of surplus in the War Department; in other words, to take away from the Secretary of War and the men in charge of our Military Establishment the authority and power to fix the amount of surplus of a certain commodity or article now held by the War Department. I have always been one of those who believed that Congress should control the size of the Army, the enlisted personnel, and the commissioned personnel. I think that is a function of Congress. It is the duty of Congress in order to protect the people. The General Staff or the Secretary of War should never be clothed with the power of fixing the size of the Army; but the General Staff and the Secretary of War in all good faith, when they want, for instance, to increase the number of cannon that we have as armament, or the number of rifles, or the amount of cloth to be held in reserve, should come to Congress and get appropriations for that purpose. They have done that in the past. We have appropriated from time to time for armament, for ordnance, for all the things that go to take care of the Army in time of peace, and incidentally in an emergency. The World War came on and we gave them blanket authority. They went out and bought thousands and thousands of automobiles to be used in the Great War. The war ended. The War Department had on hand these thousands and tens of thousands of automobiles.

Now the question comes up, What are we going to do with them? Shall we let them stand out in the open air, as one gentleman says, to rot down, or shall they be transferred to some other departments or sold to the people? We have been fighting over that for a long time, but Congress has hesitated, and properly hesitated, in taking away from the Secretary of War the power to declare them surplus. But, as one gentleman has said here, this thing has become almost a national scandal, and Congress has determined in this particular instance to direct the War Department to sell some of these automobiles. But I hope, gentlemen of this committee and of the House, that this action will not be taken as a proper precedent for the control of surplus in the War Department in the future, because, in my judgment, you could wreck and ruin the Military Establishment of our country if the actions of this House in the last few days, in its desire to hit a head wherever it was shown that apparently belonged to the Army, should be indiscriminately followed. While I shall not object seriously to this amendment, I hope it will not be taken as a precedent.

Mr. WYANT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WYANT. What length of time ought it to take the War Department to determine what surplus we have? The armistice was signed two years and three months ago. How much time do you want the War Department to take?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman that the determination of that question involves both the present and the future. In the War Department they have contended on the one hand that we ought to prepare for nine divisions; that we ought to have a reserve on hand for nine divisions in case an emergency should arise. In peace time there is no practical need for an Army of nine divisions.

Mr. WYANT. Is it not true that the life of an automobile

out in the swamp is only a couple of years?

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not know the exact length of time. Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question. As I understand it, the gentleman is in accord with the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I want to call attention to the fact that the amendment does not change the language in the bill requiring the sale during the first six months of the calendar year. If this bill does not become a law until the last week in June, which is possible, it would force the sale of seven or eight thousand auto-mobiles within a week, because in order to comply with the law they would have to be sold by July 1. Does not the gentleman think that it would be wise to extend the time 30 days?

Mr. ANTHONY. If the language were construed as strictly as the gentleman suggests, the time should be extended. Does not the gentleman think that if the order was given for the sale before July 1 that it would comply with the intent of the

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Your bill says:

That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell, or to dispose of by transfer to the Department of Agriculture under existing laws, for its own use and the use of the several States in road work and maintenance of roads, not less than one-half by sale, so many motor trucks and passenger-carrying automobiles as will, in addition to such trucks and automobiles as have been sold or transferred since January 1, 1921, aggregate during the first six months of the calendar vear—

And so forth.

Mr. ANTHONY. I should have no objection to extending the

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I think the gentleman might suggest to the gentleman from New York some date that would enable us to sell the trucks.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman from New York advises me

that he will offer such an amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last ord. The gentleman from Illinois suggested a moment ago that the justification for holding these surplus trucks seemed to be on the theory that they needed in reserve at all times sufficient trucks and automobiles for nine divisions. Does the gentleman think it practicable to keep in reserve these auto-Does the mobiles out in the open where they deteriorate, simply because they might need them in a future war?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I think they ought to be sold, but I think they should fix the time within which

they are to be sold.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

Mr. WINGO. I will yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are many automobile trucks stored at Camp Holabird that have been knocked down and placed in crates so that they can not deteriorate. I am not acquainted with the condition of trucks standing out in the open unless it refers to those crated suitable for shipment abroad.

Mr. WINGO. I have not seen them lately, but I have an idea

now that the summer social season is open that all of these passenger-carrying vehicles will be in use.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that all serviceable automobiles have been put in commission for social purposes.

Mr. WINGO. It may be so; I have noticed that some of the cars used for midnight social functions bore indications of having been used some time and were not new.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman was at these midnight so-

cial functions?

Mr. WINGO. No. I frequently work late at night at my office and going home on the street car I behold the gentleman frequently, apparently going to or from a social function, sweeping by in a car. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following

amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, after line 10, add the following: "The Secretary of War is hereby directed to transfer to the Bureau of Mines one light Dodge automobile truck, in good condition, for use at the mine-rescue station at Vincennes, Ind."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. MONDELL. It is a specific provision amending a general provision.

Mr. MacGREGOR. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Is not there an amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amend-

ment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 19, strike out the word "six" and insert the word nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 10, insert: "The War Department within 30 days after the approval of this act shall transfer, without cost, to the Bureau of Mines, for use at the station at Vincennes, Ind., a serviceable light motor truck.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection. The Clerk read as follows:

WATER AND SEWERS AT MILITARY POSTS.

WATER AND SEWERS AT MILITARY POSTS.

For procuring and introducing water to buildings and premises at such military posts and stations as from their situations require to be brought from a distance; for the installation and extension of plumbing within buildings where the same is not specifically provided for in other appropriations; for the purchase and repair of fire apparatus, including fire-alarm systems; for the disposal of sewage, and expenses incident thereto; for repairs to water and sewer systems and plumbing; for hire of employees, \$2,000,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for new construction work.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of inserting a letter which every Member here, I am sure, is interested in, and to enliven the occasion somewhat in view of the fact that it shows a growing interest in the Congress. I ask that the Clerk may

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

> OFFICE OF PAUL D. RANSO Atkinson, Ill., May 2, 1921.

COMMITTEE OF MANUFACTURERS AND MERCHANTS ON FEDERAL TAXATION.

Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen: Responding to your circular letter, asking for our "very frank opinion" regarding certain statements you put forth about Federal taxation, also asking for a subscription to carry on the work of the committee.

We are giving our very frank opinion, but without the subscription, and you can take it for what it appears to be worth.

In the first place, we admit the necessity for studying taxation, both Federal and local, for it has assumed the proportions of a big brown bear that dogs us day and night; and, believe me, that business men who are paying taxes are studying the question. But the necessity of the "formation of a Nation-wide organization of business men" to study the question, and the publishing of another magazine for propaganda, we are not now prepared to admit. For it seems to us that it results in simply adding another burden to the business man; for you are already primed to "accept" anything from 50 cents to \$100 per month more from the fellow you are so anxious about. We can not help but suspect that so soon as the contributions commenced to stream in, a comfortable suite of rooms in a high-priced office building

would be the result, with the inevitable highly-paid organization, the inevitable expensive magazine with its inevitable place in the inevitable waste basket.

inevitable expensive magazine with its inevitable place in the inevitable waste basket.

Every few weeks we receive an earnest plea for funds from some organization that is trying to save the country. The American Forestry Association are anxious about saving trees and modestly ask for a \$50 check. The American Defense Society are solicitous about the patriotism of the people and think if we would remit them \$50 that it would hold off the "reds" quite a while. Another bunch are right on edgabout the income tax and would appreciate it very much if we would inclose our check for \$50, and so it goes. We doubt not but that they "all be honorable men" with good intentions, but the tendency of the times to rush every new idea into an expensive organization and overorganization may become more of a menace than some of the things they are so anxious about.

At Washington we have bureau after bureau, and commissions and committees galore who are paid to investigate all questions under the sun; to say nothing about a President and Cabinet, who are men of affairs, and who are supposed to know everything and do everything for everybody, and a Congress composed of men and women who have been selected on account of their peculiar fitness to serve the people; they are studying and trying to work out the problems that all are thinking about, and they are paid to do it; why drag in something else? No, gentlemen, you can not have my money for what I consider a useless propaganda about taxation. I am sending all of my kicks about legislation or suggestions for reforms directly to my Congressman, or to our Senator, or even to my President; and if I happen to have an extra \$50 or \$100 I shall remit it directly to them, for they are not any too well paid for the work we expect them to do for us.

Thanking you for the opportunity for expression, I am

Yours, truly,

P. D. Ransom.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill, as follows:

The provisions of the act of February 28, 1919, relating to the Issuance of uniforms to discharged enlisted men are hereby repealed: Provided, That such uniforms shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of said act to those enlisted men who served in the Army of the United States at any time between April 6, 1917, and January 1, 1920, whose applications therefor shall have been received at the War Department prior to June 1, 1921.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropria-

order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by existing law.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, of course the intent of the paragraph is to effect an economy. If the paragraph is out it means that the item of clothing will have to be increased \$16,000,000 in order to take care of the probable demand under the act of February 28, 1919.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Does not the gentleman think that the

men have most all received it?

Mr. ANTHONY. By far the largest proportion of the men entitled to the clothing have asked for it and it was deemed advisable to have it closed up at this time, otherwise the War Department is compelled to maintain an aggregate of \$16,000,000 worth of clothing to meet a possible demand.

But the demands are slackening off and evidently the men do not care to ask for it, so that it would be better to shut it off.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would state that I would not object to a time limitation, but the trouble is in repealing the provision which authorizes the issuance you necessarily repeal the provision which permits the wearing, as that clause is tied to the

clause in reference to the issuance.

Mr. ANTHONY. We have just repealed that relating to

issuance.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The trouble is the clause authorizing the wearing of the uniform is tied onto the same sentence which authorizes the issuance in the original act. You could not repeal all of this paragraph without repealing the clause allowing the soldiers who have uniforms to wear them.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Here is the original act. The original act says:

Any person who served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the present war, may, upon honorable discharge and return to civil life, permanently retain one complete suit of outer uniform clothing, including the overcoat, and such articles of personal apparel and equipment as may be authorized, respectively, by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and may wear such uniform clothing after such discharge.

Now, "and may wear" is a clause in the sentence authorizing the issuance. Now, if you repeal the sentence authorizing the issue of clothing, you necessarily repeal the clause authorizing them to wear, and they can only wear them for three months under the old law after issuance

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, what the gentleman has read has nothing to do with the issuing of the uniform. It is only that part of the same paragraph relating to the issuance that is repealed.

Mr. JONES of Texas. But it is all connected up in the same sentence.

Mr. WALSH. The portion of the paragraph repealed only relates to the issuance of the uniform.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not see how you are going to have an authorization in the form of a clause which would not be a complete sentence and which would have no meaning.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The authority to wear the uni-

form already issued can remain in the law.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It does not say so; that is the point I am making. I do not object to the time limitation. I think in repealing the law authorizing the issuance you necessarily repeal the law authorizing the wearing of the uniform, because of the way the two are tied together in the law.

Mr. MONDELL. This does not repeal the law relative to

wear.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I think it does.

Mr. MONDELL. It repeals the provision with regard to the issuance, but there is no repeal that would affect the right to wear these uniforms. The repeal is simply of the provision relative to issuance.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I grant you that, but the clause authorizing the wearing is so tied up and interwoven with the clause authorizing the issuance that you can not repeal one without repealing the other. Otherwise it would leave it meaningless.

Mr. MONDELL. By no possible construction could this be

held to be a repeal of the right to wear the uniform.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Would the gentleman think it would improve the language if we say, "That portion of the act of February 28," instead of "provision"?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have drafted an amendment along

that line, and I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point

Mr. JONES of Texas. No; I do not; but if the gentleman is going to offer a proper amendment, I will, if the chairman will offer the amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will do so.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Then I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, beginning at line 8, page 36, to change the language where it reads, "The provisions of the act of February 28," and so forth. Strike out the words "the provisions" and insert "that portion of the act."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 8, strike out the words "the provisions" and insert in lieu thereof the words "that portion."

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Jones of Texas offers a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas: Page 36, line 8, strike out the words "the provisions" and insert in lieu thereof "section 1"; and, in line 9, strike out the word "are" and insert the word "is"; and, in line 10, strike out the word "repealed" and insert "amended by adding at the end of such section the following proviso."

Mr. ANTHONY. What is the effect of the amendment? What proviso is it?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I add the one in the bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman quote section 1 of the act, so we will know?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The one I read before:

That any person who served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the present war-

And so forth.

Mr. ANTHONY. Would not the language I have suggested, That portion of the act," cover it?

Mr. MONDELL. Has the gentleman offered an amendment? The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offered an amendment by way of a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas

Mr. MONDELL. I reserve a point of order on the substitute. Mr. ANTHONY. Is not the amendment I have suggested the

simplest way?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I believe the gentleman's amendment accomplishes the same thing, and I will withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas withdraws his amendment.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment, at the end of line 9, page 36, to strike out the word "are" and insert the word "is

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 9, page 36, strike out the word "are" and insert the word "is."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman-

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman

from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. DALLINGER. I move to strike out the last word. do this in order to obtain some information from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]. I would like to ask him if, in connection with his duties as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he knows whether or not there is anyone connected with the War Department whose duty it is to see that when supplies of clothing or other things are desired for the Army there is not on hand already in the possession of the department, left over from the late war, plenty of those particular commodities?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is the duty of the Quartermaster General.
Mr. DALLINGER. Now, Mr. Chairman, apparently whoever
has charge of this has not functioned for some time. My attention has recently been called to the fact that the Quarter-master Department of the Army has recently sent out bids for certain kinds of new clothing cloth for use in the Army, while at the same time the Government is selling the same kind of clothing at a very low price, way below cost, in order to get rid of a surplus supply. It seems to me when there is this immense amount of material on hand that has been left over from the war there ought to be some inventory taken and there ought to be somebody in the War Department who knows what they have on hand, so that they will not be purchasing new goods of the same kind.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman is criticizing one bureau of the War Department. But does he take into consideration the fact that the General Staff has been operating ever since the war began, and that orders are still given from the General Staff without regard to what these bureaus desire to do? The bureaus receive direction to do things that in their opinion are probably unwise, but it is not fair to hold an individual bureau responsible for something for which they are not responsible under present conditions.

Mr. DALLINGER. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be some reorganization of the War Department so that this inexcusable waste may be stopped in the interest of the tax-

payers?

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly. There is a law to the effect that the General Staff should not operate, but it does operate, and it does the same kind of thing the gentleman complains

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can see the slightest change in the conduct of the War Department since the change of administration, in refer-

ence to these matters?

Mr. DALLINGER. I will say in reply to the gentleman from South Dakota that while there has not been any appreciable change as yet, it is only fair to say that the present administration has only recently taken charge and that one of the duties of this Congress and this administration is to reorganize the War Department and the other departments so that these abuses will not continue.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. And the gentleman hopes

to see it improve very shortly?

Mr. DALLINGER. I do.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman know when it is going to begin?

Mr. DALLINGER. I do not know when it is going to begin, and that is the reason I asked the question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Anthony].

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an

amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ketcham: Page 36, line 15, strike out the word "June" and insert in lieu thereof the word "September."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of horses of ages, sex, and size as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War for remounts for officers entitled to public mounts for the Cavalry, Artillery, Signal Corps, and Engineers, the United States Military Academy, service schools, and staff colleges, and for the Indian Scouts, and for such Infantry and members of the Medical Department in field campaigns as may be required to be mounted, and the expenses incident thereto (including \$50,000 for purchase of remounts, and \$150,000 for encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army, including cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, and for the purchase of animals for breeding purposes and their maintenance), \$200,100: Provided, That the number of horses purchased under this appropriation, added to the number now on hand, shall be limited to the actual needs of the mounted service, including reasonable provisions for remounts, and unless otherwise ordered by the Secretary of War no part of this appropriation shall be paid out for horses not purchased by contract after competition duly invited by the Quartermaster Corps and an inspection under the direction and authority of the Secretary of War. When practicable, horses shall be purchased in open market at all military posts or stations, when needed, within a maximum price to be fixed by the Secretary of War: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any horse below the standard set by Army Regulations for Cavalry and Artillery horses, except when purchased as remounts or for instruction of cadets at the United States Military Academy; Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for poloponies except for West Point Military Academy, and such ponies shall not be used at any other place: Provided further, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, accept donations of anim

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.
Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order on the paragraph. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order to the language on page 37, beginning in line 1 with the word "and" and covering the balance of that line, and all of lines 2, 3, and 4, and that part of line 5 down to and including the word "maintenance," which is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think that that part of the paragraph is subject to a point of order, because it clearly relates to the acquisition of horses for the Army, which

we are authorized to do by law.

Mr. BLANTON. If there is any law that authorizes the War Department to go over the country and buy stallions and send them down to Texas and turn them over to ranchmen free of charge and let those ranchmen breed them for their private benefit free of charge, with no obligation on their part whatever to sell the progeny to the Government, and with no claim whatever on the progeny, I would like to know it. Is there any such law?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. When was it passed?

Mr. ANTHONY. The law is carried in the authority for the Army to acquire horses. This appropriation is made toward that end. Whether we go out in the open market and buy them or whether we buy stallions and mares and breed them, we are

authorized to do it.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the old provisions, which were not authorized by law, the War Department forced these men who breed to these horses to obligate themselves to sell the progeny to the Government. But there is no such obligation here. The men may keep all of the progeny for their own use and private benefit if they see fit, and the Government will not profit in any way whatever by the transaction. I ask the gentleman to cite the Chair to any law that authorizes this Government to go into the business of horse raising, not for the benefit of the Army but for the benefit of private individuals. There is no such provision of law. I have the reports here and the statements from the Army officers, showing exactly what the purpose and intention of the appropriation is. I submit to the Chair that there is no such law authorizing any such business.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Anthony] cite to the Chair authority for this?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think there is any specific law, Mr. Chairman. It is only under the general law authorizing us

to appropriate for horses for the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Chair please, the general law authorizing the War Department to acquire horses for cavalry purposes does not limit the War Department on the question whether they shall be purchased after they are grown or whether they shall be bred by the War Department. The appropriation which is carried in the current law, the appropriation act for 1921, is in practically the same language as that carried

in the present bill.

Now, the War Department, for convenience, may purchase all the horses which it may need for remounts or for cavalry or for riding purposes, or it may under the law, without specific authority, breed them all if it could do so. This bill limits the use of this \$150,000 to the encouragement of the breeding of horses suitable for the Army. There is nothing in the bill or in the general law that squints at letting these horses out for private benefit. They may incidentally be of private benefit to the people at large, but the primary purpose of this appropriation is for the breeding of horses throughout the country that are suitable for the Army and suitable for cavalry and riding purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Mr. WALSH. What provision of law authorizes them to

cooperate with the Bureau of Animal Industry?

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, the Bureau of Animal Industry in 1910 began the performance of this very duty. It was taken over by the War Department a couple of years ago, and last year, when this appropriation was made, it was under the authority of the appropriation contained in that bill that these horses that were formerly under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Animal Industry were taken over by the remount service of the War Department, and in cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry the remount service of the War Department is now performing this function.

Mr. WALSH, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for

another question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman from Kentucky contend that the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture had supervision of the breeding of cavalry horses

for the War Department?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; from 1910 to 1921 the Bureau of Animal Industry had charge of the breeding of these horses, and they had a contract with every owner of a colt that was the result of this breeding to the effect that at the age of 3 years it was to be sold to the Army for \$150.

Mr. WALSH. How did they come to cease that work?

Mr. BARKLEY. Because the War Department thought they were better qualified to carry on the breeding of Army horses than the Department of Agriculture, and when this appropriation was made in the bill for 1921 for that purpose the Bureau of Animal Industry turned over its equipment to the remount service of the War Department, and that remount service is now carrying on the work previously conducted by the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. WALSH. What does this language mean? Is it that they are going to give the Bureau of Animal Industry another

Mr. BARKLEY. No. It means that the Bureau of Animal Industry has outstanding certain contracts which it made when it had charge of this work. Most of these contracts have been canceled or have lapsed, but there are still outstanding certain contracts which have been made with private individuals, and to that extent this cooperation must go on.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear me just

a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman. Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, to show how ridiculous this

provision is and to show how it has been carried on without authority of law, I call the attention of the Chair to the previous appropriation in the last bill. Out of that appropriation \$350 was used to buy a horse called Decameron, and it was turned over to my constituent, Mr. Ben V. Simons, at Paint Rock, Tex., in my district; and \$600 was spent for a horse named John R. Clay and turned over to Mr. George Richardson, at San Angelo, Tex., in the district of my colleague from Texas. Mr. Hudspeth; and \$1,000 was spent for a horse named Von Tromp, which was turned over to Mr. D. H. Snyder, jr., of Colorado, Tex., in the district of my colleague, Mr. Hudspeth; and \$1,000 was spent for a horse named Mac and turned over to Mr. Fletcher Harper, of Paloduro, Tex., in the district of my colleague, Mr. Jones. And so on in the case of others. Only one little scrap of paper has been taken from these individuals showing that the horses belonged to the Government. They have been given to these individuals for their own use if they so desire, without any expense whatever to themselves, as they receive back from the Government all breeding fees they charge. There is not a single word in the present agreement that binds them, regardless of what has been in the agreements made in the past, to sell the progeny to the Government. Formerly they agreed to sell the progeny to the Government, but | ized under the law, of creating a type of horses that the Gov-

under the present agreement there is no arrangement that they will sell the progeny to the Government. In other words, these private individuals, all our friends in Texas, are getting the benefit of the expenditure of public money in the private horse business, to the detriment of the whole people of the United States.

I direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that there is no law authorizing any such private horse industry in this

country.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I want to make just this suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman. Mr. WINGO. The only law that I recall authorizing the expenditure of money for horses is a law that contemplates horses for use, and there is a clear distinction between keeping a horse for breeding purposes and keeping a horse for use. In this matter I think we ought to be very careful. You see the jealousy that has already been raised over the distribution of free studs even in Texas [laughter], and if you make a precedent of it, every Member of Congress will want free study distributed in his district, and it will become a public scandal. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman from Arkansas will not

need any for his. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. It may be that when I get into the condition of the gentleman from Kentucky I will have a personal interest in the matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I am afraid there is a good deal of jealousy

already on the gentleman's part. [Laughter.]
Mr. WINGO. No. The jealousy exhibited between the gentlemen from Texas over the distribution in their districts causes me to fear for the safety of the Public Treasury. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wanted to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that even if, down in the gentleman's district in Texas, the War Department turned over one of its horses to some private individual, it has nothing to do with the point of order. fact is all these animals are turned over to private individuals in the various States. The language to which the gentleman makes the point of order is the language from the word "including," on page 36, the words included in the parentheses, and those are, "including \$50,000 for the purchase of remounts and \$150,000 for the encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army." Now, that is a perfectly legitihorses suitable for the Army." Now, that is a perfectly legiti-mate appropriation under the law authorizing the War Department to acquire cavalry horses.

Then the remainder of the language provides-

And \$150,000 for encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army, including cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, and for the purchase of animals for breeding purposes and their maintenance,

They are authorized to purchase these animals. These horses are actually used eight months in the year at the remount stations to take the places of other horses that would be necessary, and they are only used for breeding purposes during about four months of the year. While I do not think that has anything to do with the point of order, it has as much to do with it as the facts recited by the gentleman from Texas. The question is whether the Army has the power under the present law to acquire, either by purchase or by breeding, horses suitable for the Army, either Cavalry horses or the draft horses which are needed by the department.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman from Kentucky

yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Mr. JONES of Texas. Is there any obligation on the part of the person who grows one of these horses to sell it to the

Mr. BARKLEY. Not under the present arrangement; no. Mr. JONES of Texas. Then could it be regarded as raising

horses for the Army?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is for the purpose of creating a type of horse that will enable the Army to obtain what it wants when it needs it. When the Bureau of Animal Industry had charge of it they had a contract with the owner of the colt that was produced, requiring him to sell it to the Government for \$150. That worked an injustice both to the owner and to the Government. The Government was obligated to buy it when it was years old, whether it needed the colt or not, and to pay 50 for it. On the other hand, the owner was obligated to \$150 for it. sell it whether he wanted to or not. He might have been able to obtain \$200 or \$300 for it.
Mr. JONES of Texas. Under this provision the Government

has no claim on the colt and the owner does not have to sell it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. It is the general proposition, author-

ernment will be able to purchase whenever it needs cavalry or other horses for the Army.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The fact that the Government has acted wisely in one instance and sent two horses down into my district where they raise pure-blood stock, both men and horses, does not have anything to do with this point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think that has anything to do with it, and I do not think the fact that they have sent a couple of horses down into another district where they only breed jackasses has anything to do with it either. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Did the gentleman ever know of the Government getting any horses as the result of this expenditure?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes. Fifty thousand dollars of this appropriation is for the purpose of carrying out contracts previously made for the purchase of these horses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This paragraph provides, among other things, for the procuring of horses for animal transportation and mounts for the Army. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Blanton] makes a point of order against the language on page 37, beginning in line 1-

And \$150,000 for encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army.

It is clear that the constitutional authority to raise armies and properly equip them would authorize the procuring of horses for the Cavalry and for other necessary horse transportation. seems to the Chair that the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army might be a proper method for securing them. Horses have been purchased for the use of the Army from the beginning of the Government, and for a number of years considerable sums of money have been appropriated for the breeding of Army horses. The only question which has caused the Chair to hesitate arises from the use of the words "for encouragement It is not entirely clear just what this language means, and such information as the Chair has received during the discussion on the point of order has not entirely clarified the matter, because most of the debate went to the merits of the proposition rather than to the point of order. It is urged that in order to make it possible for the Government to procure by purchase suitable horses for military purposes it is necessary to encourage in the way provided in the bill or otherwise the breeding of the type of horse required. The question is not free from doubt in the mind of the present occupant of the chair, but resolving the doubt in favor of the Army in case the necessity should exist as claimed, it seems to the Chair that under the authority for raising and equipping the Army it ought to be proper for Congress to appropriate not only for the purchase of horses but also to acquire horses by breeding them, or to encourage the breeding of such horses as might not be otherwise available. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Jounson of South Dakota: Page 36, after the figures "1921," in line 15-

Mr. BARKLEY. We have passed that,

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It is to strike out the whole of the next paragraph. It is to strike out the paragraph commencing with line 16, on page 36, down to and including line 11, on page 38. We have not passed that yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Johnson of South Dakota: Page 36, line 16, strike out the paragraph beginning with line 16, page 36, down to and including line 11, on page 38.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The amendment which I desire to offer is a perfecting amendment to the text.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be in order before voting on the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota,

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. There is no amendment that can be offered to this paragraph that will prevent my mov-

ing to strike it out.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has an amendment to perfect the text. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BARKLEY: Page 37, line 1, strike out "\$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof \$250,000."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to offer an amendment which involves an increase in the appropriation carried in this bill, but in this particular instance I think the increase is instified.

I desire to call attention to some facts connected with the purposes for which this appropriation is intended. As I suggested a while ago during the discussion on the point of order, in 1910 the Congress provided that the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Department of Agriculture might engage in the encouragement of the propagation of proper horses throughout the country that would be suitable for the Cavalry of the United States Under the arrangement that was made between the Bureau of Animal Industry and the owners in the carrying out of this project, primarily for the purpose of aiding the War Department in the acquirement of suitable Cavalry horses, they had a contract with the owner of every mare that the product was to be sold to the Government at the age of 3 years for \$150. arrangement has now ceased, although there are some overlapping contracts provided for in the \$50,000 appropriation. It was found that that arrangement was neither just to the Government nor to the owner, because it obligated the Government to purchase the horse at 3 years of age whether the Government needed it or not, and it obligated the owner to sell the horse for \$150, although he might be able to sell to others for a larger So now the arrangement which is carried out by the remount service of the Army, which has taken this over under the present appropriation of \$250,000 in the current appropriation bill, may distribute these horses around over the country.

There are now about 150 of these horses distributed in various States of the Union—I think every State outside of two or three has all the way from 3 up to 15 horses. They are not distributed to private individuals for the purpose of serving private interests, as the gentleman from Texas suggested a while ago but they are turned even to the serving private interests. while ago, but they are turned over to some one who is skilled in the breeding and propagation of horses. The farmer obtains the use of a stallion at the nominal price of something like \$10. That money is turned into the Treasury and the man who operates the horse is compensated for looking after them by an amount practically equal to the \$10. The War Department has reported that since the appropriation of \$250,000 was made in the appropriation bill of 1921 there have been some 500 requests from all over the United States for horses for breeding purposes. They now have 150 stallions. More than 60 have been donated to the War Department by private citizens of the United States who are interested in the propagation of suitable Cavalry horses for the Army of the United States. These horses that have been given to the Army are worth on an average about \$5,000 apiece, so that the private interests, private, enterprising citizens interested in the improvement of the breeding of horses in the United States, have donated to the Government more than \$300,000 worth of these horses in order that they may express their desire and confidence in and for the improvement in the breeding of our horses.

So that there is a demand for three times as many horses as are in existence. If this appropriation is cut to \$150,000, as proposed in the bill, it means that much of the work that has been already done will be destroyed. It has only started since last year, because the appropriation was only available in the bill for 1921, and the work has just begun. Now, if you reduce the amount just as the remount service begins its work, just as the breeding starts on its first year after the appropriation is made, you will practically cripple the department and destroy the work that has already been done.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does not the gentleman from Kentucky think that the expense should be borne by the Department of Agriculture because it is more important for the interests of the farmer than it is for the military arm of the Government?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not; Congress took it away from the Agricultural Department after it had been in the Agricultural Department for 10 years. Now, gentlemen may ask why it is necessary that the Government should spend \$250,000 to improve the breed of horses in the United States. As a matter of fact there is not now in the United States, to any very large extent, a cavalry type of horse. I see that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Greene] nods his head in assent.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Does the gentleman think that in any war that we have had of late years cavalry horses were necessary?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do. When the war began in Europe up to the time when both armies dug in, the Cavalry performed a very high service in both the allied and the German Armies. Had it not been for the fact that the armies on both sides dug in and engaged in trench warfare the Cavalry would have performed as high a function as in any war of the world.

Mr. WYANT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.
Mr. WYANT. In view of the fact that we are advocating economy, does the gentleman think that the addition of \$100,000 to this appropriation for the purpose of increasing the amount for the Army, increasing the number and type of cavalry horses,

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I favor the increase or I would not have offered the amendment. The result of the appropriation can not be felt by the Army or the country at large for three years, because it takes that long for a horse to be bred to the age when he is serviceable either to the Cavalry or to the farm.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.
Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman might have answered the query by suggesting that the supply of horses is not relatively necessary to the number of enlisted men in the Army. There is a certain overhead that is necessary to be taken care of. It is the type, the strain, and the stock that we are looking

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the creation of all of the necessary horse life from which the War Department may take their

Cavalry horses.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Has the gentleman ever seen a Cavalry horse or expect to see one operate against a tank, barbed wire, machine gun, poison gas, or high explosive such as we had in the last war and will have in every future war?

Mr. BARKLEY. The horse, perhaps, does not operate directly against the tank or poison gas. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman will look into the history of the late Civil War, he will see that there was 1 horse for every 33 men, and in the last war there was 1 horse for every 4 men in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. And there were seven or eight saddles for every horse also, but that is no criterion for

the number of saddles necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are not engaged in improving the breed

of saddles. This provision relates to horses.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman knows that the best students of military science, basing their opinion on the study and observation of the recent war, are still of the mind that cavalry will play an important part in future wars.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. Gen. Allenby, of the British Army performed one of the greatest cavalry feats ever per-

formed by any cavalry in the world's history.

Is it not true that Pershing's column went into Mexico in 1916 on horses and those horses were absolutely necessary for the Cavalry of the United States?

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely. And furthermore if there is ever a war of large dimensions in the United States, our coast line is so extensive and our territory so broad that trench warfare will be found to be impractical, and we will revert to the old type of war where Infantry and Cavalry will continue to function as they have in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for five minutes more.
Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object. We

are making no progress.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wanted to refer to the experience of the British Army in undertaking to get cavalry horses in this

Mr. ANTHONY. I object, Mr. Chairman. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am against this amendment for a good many reasons. In the first place, the purchase of these horses by the Federal Government simply means the shifting of their ownership and use from private to Federal ownership but private That is all there is about it. There is not a single horse that is going to be put into activity under this bill that would not be in private activity under private control. That is the first proposition. Now, the second proposition is this: If we want to raise horses in this country we must make it possible for the man who grows the colt to get some money out of it. The psychology of the farmer is exactly like the psychology of anybody else. Now, the whole plan of this item with reference to horses is wrong. In the first place, we take the people's money and we buy a stallion that is already in use; we withdraw him from his present use and remove him from his pres-

ent locality and send him down to some individual. We do not directly pay that individual what he gets for the use of that horse, but we do. He collects about \$10 per season for each colt sired, and that money is covered into the Treasury; then we pay him for the feeding and keeping of the horse an amount equal to what he collects for the service of the horse. That comes out of public funds. No wonder they have 500 applications for these horses. The keeper gets his service for nothing and something besides. When we come to purchase horses under this item, instead of buying the horses from the people who raise them, under the provisions of this bill they are to be bought from contractors. When the Federal Government wants some horses for use it advertises for bids, and one or more of these professional contractors respond. Then the contractor farms out his bid to a lot of subcontractors, who must have profits also; and on a horse that the Federal Government pays \$175, for instance, the man who has put up the feed and the time to raise the horse will be lucky if he gets \$100 for it. There is the vice of this whole system. The Government does a whole lot of things it ought not to do and fails to do the thing it ought to do, namely, to give the best price which the Government can pay to the individual who raises the colt. I was raised on a stock farm in middle Tennessee, and we had as fine saddle horses there as anywhere on earth, and we did not have to have the Federal Government acting as guardian and donator of stallions. They raised their own stallions, and just as long as the colt was worth the breeding and the care there was no dearth of horses in that country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Briefly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the gentleman know that during the recent war when our Government and the British Government sought to obtain cavalry horses in the United States they both reported that there was no such kind of horses here, and that the only thing was to try and get a substitute

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I can not yield further, but let me ask the gentleman this question: Is there a single horse that will be purchased under the \$100,000 increase of appropriations, if granted, that will not be in service this year? retire to the shades of private life because the Federal Government does not own them?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What are you going to take the people's money to buy these herses for? Now, you can not give them to each of the 500 applicants, and you are going to play favorites with the people's money; that is the proposition here in this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Army remount service, of course, exercises its discretion in determining the communities in which

these horses are to be located.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; it takes a horse out of use in a community and makes the people pay for it and ships it off somewhere else and gives its services free. The Government will pay for its feed, pay for its shipping back to the Army post in order to use him. You have to take this horse off the farm where it is loaned and take him away back to the station and put a second lieutenant riding him around and in the next eight months ship him out again, and it is absolutely foolish. I am in favor of the Government doing all it ought to do, but the Government has no business taking the people's money and putting it in an activity where the private citizen can properly function. Tell me that the private citizenship of this country can not raise good horses without the control of the Government-it is absurd.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield for a

suggestion?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know about a suggestion. Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then I will put it in the form

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate be

now closed-

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have an amendment which is before the committee.

Mr. ANTHONY. On the pending amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amend-

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is closed only on this amendment. Mr. JONES of Texas. I am afraid if his amendment is voted up, mine will not be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can offer his amendment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would like to have it pending, Mr.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jones of Texas: Page 36, line 18, strike out the paragraph and insert:

"For the purchase of horses of ages, sex, and size as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, \$50,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for polo ponies: Provided further, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, accept donations of animals for breeding and donations of money or other property to be used as prizes or awards at agricultural fairs, horse shows, or similar exhibitions, in order to encourage the breeding of riding horses suitable for Army puposes."

The CHAIDMAN The question is on the amendment of the

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order

that that is not a substitute for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not offered as such.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have an

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will necessarily be voted on before the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Johnson].

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amend-

ment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones].

The amendment was again read.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this, it seems to me, would protect all the Government might get by way of donations from anyone who might want to donate an animal such as has been under discussion here, for the use of the Army. At the same time the appropriation is sufficient to handle the proper distribution of the same and to take care of those now on hand. In so far as making an appropriation for the Army to go into the horse business, I think it is about as absurd a proposition as I ever heard of. If the Government is going into the horse business, which I think would be an unwise thing to do, it should either put it in the Bureau of Animal Industry or in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Those of you who followed the Army bill two and three years ago know that the Army came in here just after the war was over, when they had more than 200,000 horses, and asked for and received an appropriation of \$3,000,000 to buy more horses. They gave as an excuse that they needed a certain type of horses, and said they probably would not need all the \$3,000,000, but that what was not needed would be re-covered into the Treasury. But at the end of the year they had spent that \$3,000,000, and in the meantime had sold 162,000 horses that cost them an average of \$200 apiece for an average of \$90 apiece. That is great business. Do you want to turn a business matter over to the Army when they handled that matter in such a way? They have never made a success financially of any proposition, and they are not to be blamed, for that is not their line of business. If you are going to raise horses, do you want to turn them over to an Army man or over to people who engage in the horse business as a private business?

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the gentleman know that these horses are put in the care of experienced horse raisers and breeders throughout the country, who look after them during

the breeding season?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I certainly know that. They are put in the hands of individual people who do not have to sell a horse to the Army unless it a horse that is not wanted. The same man who is allowed this animal can breed 30 or 40 mares and keep all the horses he cares anything about and not sell any of them to the Government. Besides, the man engaged in the business of growing horses does not have a selection. The Army man goes off to some place else and takes a gift horse, which may or may not be worth much, or he purchases a horse and sends it down and the man uses it for his own use and benefit. The man who uses it may have no choice in the selection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does not the gentleman from Texas understand, if this law is carried on, that at any time these stallion managers can come in and probably get commissions and the right of retirement for rendering a great service to the Military Establishment, and that they could not do that over at the

Department of Agriculture? Mr. JONES of Texas. They might do that, but the trouble is this, that the Bureau of Animal Industry tried this proposition out and found that it was not a good business proposition. The only concern that can make any good business out of giving

stallions away is an organization that does not know anything about business except the spending side. The Bureau of Animal Industry tried out the same proposition, except they had a contract by which the owner was forced to sell any of these animals that were grown as a result of the work of the stallion. Here you are going to turn a man loose without even a contract by which the Government can obtain these horses. This amendment reserves the gift appropriation, and if anybody wants to give an animal it will be something new under the sun.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr.

Johnson] has a preferential amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is it not necessary to dispose of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones] before that?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the gentleman from South Dakota has a preferential amendment to perfect the text, which ought to be acted upon first.

Mr. ANTHONY. I thought he wanted to strike out the entire

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say to the chairman of the committee that I have changed my amendment so as to make it preferential to the other motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Johnson of South Dakota: Page 36, line 15, after the figures "1921," strike out the paragraph down to and including the word "place" in line 24, page 37.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I will say that if this amendment of mine happens to fail in the committee I shall heartily favor the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones], because it will accomplish part of the work that I think ought to be done. I have come to the conclusion that it is almost time the War Department and some of the Members of this House ought to be trying to cut down expenses, instead of continually adding to them. [Applause.] We had at the time of the armistice about 350,000 to 360,000 horses, which were purchased at an exorbitant price, and a great majority of them were practically given away.

Now, the War Department comes in and wants two or three hundred thousand dollars more, so that they may purchase stallions to give to certain preferred individuals in the United States for their own use. Why, we might as well have an appropriation brought in here to purchase jacks, so that we can improve the race of mules for Artillery purposes, or to purchase bulls, in order to improve the race of cattle so that we might get good milk for the Army. You might as well appropriate to buy Packard cars to improve Fords to haul the artillery. The

whole thing is absurd. The fact that the chairman of the committee is compelled to have this kind of a provision, "That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for polo ponies except for West Point Military Academy, and such ponies shall not be used at any other place," is indicative of the way the War Department has used appropriations of this kind and of the way it would use them if it had the slightest opportunity. It is time, I say, that we retrench and commence to try to recover money back from the individuals who have robbed this Government during the war

rather than spend more money at this time. For instance, the War Department-and I presume that must mean the Secretary of War and the General Staff-have asked the chairman of this committee, a gentleman who believes in economy and lives up to his promises, for this appropriation of a few hundred thousand dollars, while at the same time, on April 6. the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Daugherty, filed with the Secretary of War a request in writing, signed by two of his assistants, W. H. Herron, brother-in-law of President Taft, and E. B. Brewer, asking that the men who are responsible for the theft from the Government of millions of dollars in the purchase and sale of leather be indicted and prosecuted, asserting that the contract ought to be canceled at once, and that the men responsible should be tried and convicted; yet the Secretary of War has made no recommendation as to that particular kind of a case and has failed to prosecute. merely to show, as the records show, that the Secretary of War and the War Department, not only in the last administration but also in this administration, are apparently more intent on spending money than in trying to recover money back of which the Government was unlawfully deprived. [Applause.]
Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the

amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones].

I do not think there is any Member of this House more in favor of economy than I am. But the purpose of the expenditure of this \$150,000 is misunderstood, I fear, by some of the Members of the House. The purpose of it is to have a higher standard of horses established throughout the country when war comes, if it does; a standard that is suitable for cavalry

Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Sumners] says it will not produce any more horses. Why will it not? The purpose of the War Department in furnishing these thoroughbred stallions to the various stockraisers throughout the country, placing the season of that stallion at only \$10, will of itself induce owners of standard-bred mares, if you please, to take advantage of that cheap season and breed their mares to these thoroughbred stallions, and thus improve the breed of horses suitable for Army purposes, for if they bred their mares to the same breed of stallion owned by an individual it would cost at least \$100 per mare. If you breed a thoroughbred stallion to what you might call a standard-bred or a cold-blooded marethat is, the dam that has the size and the sire that has the breeding—you obtain in that "get" a horse not only of size but also of stamina. It gets the stamina by reason of the thoroughbred sire, and you must not overlook the fact that with automobiles taking the place of horses throughout this country horses are fast disappearing from the farms. Of course, when a war comes, if you are satisfied with getting some of those rat-tail Montana mares for Army horses—they are about the only thing that is abundant now in horseflesh—this amendment ought to be defeated.

I have seen this experiment work when it was under the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Department of Agriculture. I saw one of these stallions in my district. There was not one thing that the Government ever did more to encourage the breeding of standard-bred good horses than that. The War Department does not send this stallion down to some influential fellow for his individual private use. It is for the use of the community in which this man lives, an experienced man, in order that he may sort, if you please, the mares that go to that stallion, so that the progeny may be of sufficient size, and the fact that the sire is of sufficient stamina makes the best

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman

yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is it not true that the man who keeps

the stallion gets it free?

horse in the world.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Oh, perhaps he does, but he has only on the average two mares, while, as a matter of fact, a stallion can serve 50 or 60 mares in a season.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky

has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will allow the language of the provision to stand as it is in the bill. In the first place, it is necessary that we appropriate \$50.000 to buy the colts which the Government is obligated to take on contracts now in force. We will have to pay for them some time, and we might as well pay for them this year. In the next place, the \$150,000 for the breeding of riding horses will not cost us one cent. At present the Army has 107 of these Under the present system the man who takes the stallion is allowed to charge a fee of \$10 a season. That money is paid over to the Army officer and goes directly into the Treasury of the United States. Then at the end of the season the Army reimburses the man who has had the custody of this stallion, and pays him back \$10 for each mare that has been served. Consequently the Government is out no money for all of this work and labor for the encouragement and breeding of horses.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I yield. Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman know what salary is paid to the managers of these horses?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know exactly.
Mr. McKENZIE. Undoubtedly they get a thousand dollars a

Mr. ANTHONY. But the statement is made that the income

almost balances the outlay.

Mr. McKENZIE. If they get a thousand dollars a year, each stallion would have to serve 100 mares in order to pay the salary of the man. I think the gentleman is mistaken about his proposition.

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I am not mistaken. Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will t

Will the gentleman from Kansas yield for another question?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman think the War Department has a lot of nerve to come up here and ask an appropriation for these stallions without giving the chairman of the committee the necessary information about them?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have had all that information, and I just stated to the House that the \$150,000 for the expenditure for this purpose goes back into the Treasury at the end of the year. If this language remains in the bill it will allow the 107 stallions that the Army now has to go out into service in the country and improve the standards of horses. We have refused the \$100,000 additional that the Army asked and that the horse breeders of the country asked.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is it not a fact that this is the only way the Government can encourage the production of horses such as have been discussed here to-day, and is it not a fact that England, France, and other countries have proven that this is a meritorious method of producing horses of the character which is demanded for the use of the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. What the gentleman says is true, and in the way in which it is being carried on by the Army it does not

cost us a cent to do it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In addition to the use of these horses for breeding purposes, is it not true that for about eight months in the year they are back at the remount stations and Army camps and are there used in place of other horses that would have to be purchased for the use of the camps?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; they are given practical use.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. How much money is used to pay for the transportation of these horses?

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly it costs some money. Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment be now closed.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman allow me five minutes to answer some statements which have been made here?

Mr. ANTHONY. Then, at the end of five minutes I ask that all debate close on the pending amendment and amendments

thereto. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that at the end of five minutes debate close on the pending amendment and amendments thereto.

objection? Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman add five minutes to that?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think we have had enough debate on this. The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. By way of a substitute, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike

out the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I had a talk with the major in the Quartermaster's Department who inaugurated this system, who started this business of the Government going into the horse industry. He told me that the main reason for it was that the horse breeders throughout the country were not able to import the horses that were needed and were not able to buy the kind of stallions that would produce the progeny the Government needed. Then I had him give me a list of the number he had sent into Texas-11 of them-and I asked him how many of those 11 had the Government imported, and not a single one had the Government imported, but everyone of those 11 horses had either been donated by some horse fancier or had been purchased by the Government in the State of Kansas or some other place—purchased from men who had bought them for breeding

Now, when this question was up here a year or so ago, my colleague [Mr. Jones of Texas] and my colleague [Mr. Hubs-PETH] and myself attacked this provision as a waste and an extravagance on the part of the Government; and much to my surprise, shortly after that attack was made we found that this department sent a fine horse down into my district to appease me and sent two fine horses down into the district of my colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH] to appease him and sent two fine horses down into the district of my colleague [Mr. Jones of Texas] to appease him; one of which that cost this Government \$1,000, he sent up to the little place Paloduro, which is so small that even my colleague [Mr. Jones of Texas] has never yet been there, a little place up in the extreme northwest Panhandle of Texas. He sent two horses to the same man out there in that The man needs them in his business, as they save him buying two horses that he otherwise would likely have bought with his own money. I am against the Government going into this private business. If it was of any substantial value to the Government, I might be in favor of it, but when the Government says that private business will not import horses the Government is making a mistake, because everyone of these horses that was sent to Texas, if imported at all, had been imported by private individuals. I want to say that the distinguished horse breeder who died at Dallas, Tex., a few years ago, Col. Henry Exall, brought more fine horses into this country and produced more fine horses from his Electrite and Zola stallions than the War Department now owns or ever will own. He brought more fine horseflesh into the South than all this War Department will ever bring there. I say this is unnecessary. If we are going to get back to economy we can save this \$150,000 right here on this item, and we will still have plenty of fine horses. This country will have plenty of fine horses whether the War Department raises them or not. If you are going to economize, you might as well begin here.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from South

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected. The CHAIRMAN. The question is next on the amendment of The CHAIRMAN. The question is next on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones] to strike out and insert. Mr. JONES of Texas. May we have that amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jones of Texas: Page 36, line 18, strike out the paragraph and insert:

"For the purchase of horses of ages, sex, and size as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, \$50,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for pole ponies: Provided further, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, accept donations of animals for breeding and donations of money or other property to be used as prizes or awards at agricultural fairs, horse shows, and similar exhibitions, in order to encourage the breeding of riding horses suitable for Army purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Jones of Texas) there were-ayes 22, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected. Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the follownig amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 22, after the word "ponies" strike out down to and including the word "place," in line 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected. The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment

offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Blanton] which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 15, after the figures "1921," strike out the paragraph. The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected. The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERS FOR HOSPITAL STEWARDS.

For construction and repair of quarters for hospital stewards at military posts already established and occupied, \$15,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, at the end of line 4, add:
"The sum of \$10,000 for the erection of a natatorium adjoining the Government base hospital at Fort Bliss, Tex., now in course of construction. The said natatorium to be a part of said plant."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment. I will reserve it. the amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that this appropriation is for the erection of a natatorium, or swimming pool, at the base hospital at Fort Bliss, near This hospital is now in the course of erection. It will be completed or supposed to be completed on the 15th day of this month. This appropriation that I am asking for is for the continuation of this building. As I understand it, under the rule of the House, in a ruling by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] at the last session to an amendment offered by my colleague from Texas [Mr. Bee] for the purchase of additional land at and adjoining the military post of Leon Spring, near San Antonio, it was held in order because it was a continuation of that work. Now, Mr. Chairman, this appropriation that I am asking for is a continuation of the base hospital at Fort Bliss for a natatorium and amounts to \$10,000.

I want to say that I am in favor of economy and have been voting with the committee all of the time. This is a hos-

pital for these unfortunate sick persons. You say you want to take care of the ex-service men and tubercular soldiers. understand from Gen. Brooks that 150 beds of this hospital can in all probability be given over to the Government for taking care of ex-service men.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think that a natatorium is any part of the needed or necessary facilities for taking care

of tuberculous service men?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Absolutely; and if the gentleman was cognizant of the facts at this hospital, he would agree with me that a natatorium or swimming pool is necessary for sick soldiers that will be placed in the hospital. I want to say that this amendment is recommended by the Quartermaster General, They have no funds for this natatorium.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It strikes me that a natatorium at a tuberculous sanatorium is rather an unusual thing. Has it

been suggested by any medical society?

Mr. HUDSPETH. It has been suggested both by the Quartermaster General and the Surgeon General, who stated to me that it was urgently needed for sick soldiers—not tuberculous. I want to say to the gentleman that this is not a tubercular hospital, but Col. Jones, who has been at the head of the War Risk Bureau, said that he was informed by Gen. Brooks that probably they would let them have 150 beds out of the 600 for tubercular soldiers in that high climate. The hospital is a base hospital for taking care of the sick soldiers up and down the border.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It strikes me that it would be dangerous to have a public swimming pool where tuberculous

patients could go into it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I understand from the medical authorities that there is no trouble about that, that they have a treatment whereby the danger heretofore existing will be remedied.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman state whether there is a natatorium at Walter Reed Hospital?

I do not know, but I will state that this Mr. HUDSPETH. is recommended by the Surgeon General and by the Quartermaster General.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I was thinking that this Walter Reed Hospital out here is so near the Capital and under the supervision of the Surgeon General that they would, in all probability, have everything of that kind that was required, and I did not know that there was a natatorium there.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not know myself, but I know that this is recommended by the Surgeon General of the Army. Now. out at this base hospital they have no running stream or natural bathing facilities, and it is needed, as I have been

What diseases are to be treated at this Mr. KINDRED.

place besides tubercular cases?

Mr. HUDSPETH. The tubercular proposition has been injected into the matter just recently. It is a base hospital and was originally located to take care of the sick soldiers up and down the border for 300 miles, not tubercular soldiers.

It is for all classes of patients.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas makes the point of order. Will the gentleman from Texas inform the

Chair whether this work is partially completed?

Mr. HUDSPETH. The work is almost completed on the base hospital. They have no funds for a natatorium.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I will call the Chair's attention to the fact that the amendment is offered under the item for hospital stewards. The amendment would change absolutely the purpose for which the appropriation is made. Mr. HUDSPETH. It is an original appropriation.

Mr. ANTHONY. But not germane to the appropriation for hospital stewards.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

For the employment of the necessary civilian instructors in the most important trades, and for the payment of their traveling expenses, as authorized under existing law; for the purchase of carpenter's, machinist's, mason's, electrician's, and such other tools and equipment as may be required, including machines used in connection with the trades; for the purchase of materials, live stock (including fowls), and other supplies necessary for instruction and training purposes, and the construction, repair, or alteration of such buildings needed for vocational training in agriculture; for shops, storage, and shelter of machinery as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 27 of the act approved June 3, 1916, authorizing, in addition to the military training of soldiers while in the active service, means for securing an opportunity to study and receive instruction upon educational lines of such character as to increase their military efficiency and enable them to return to civil life better equipped for industrial, commercial, and general business occupations, part of this instruction to consist of vocational education either in agriculture or the mechanic arts, \$1,200,

000: Provided, That whenever possible officers, warrant officers, non-commissioned officers, or other enlisted men shall be detailed as instructors: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries of civilian instructors other than in technical branches: And provided further, That not more than \$100,000 shall be expended for salaries and no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$3,000 per annum: And provided further, That farm products and the increase in live stock (including fowls) which accrue as incidental to vocational training in agriculture and animal husbandry shall be sold under such regulations as the deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 8, strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$500,000," and after the word "salaries" strike out the words "and no person" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not more than 10 persons," so that as amended the same shall read as follows:

"That not more than \$500,000 shall be expended for salaries and not more than 10 persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$3,640."

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this provision is in conformity with section 27 of the national defense act of 1916, as amended June 5, 1920, and that provides this language:

That in addition to the military training soldiers while in the active service shall hereafter be given an opportunity to study and receive instructions upon vocational lines of such character as to increase their military efficiency and to enable them to return to civil life better equipped for industrial, commercial, and general business occupations.

I do not believe there is a man in this committee who does not believe that the provision of the national defense act is wise, that while we are training men they may be not only soldiers during their term of enlistment, they also may be trained to be better citizens, so that when they shall have served the periods of their enlistment of from one to three years they will go back to civil life better qualified to carry on the duties of a citizen in the Republic. My amendment, gentlemen, does not increase the proposed appropriation by one single, solitary cent, but simply proposes a different division and distribution of the fund. To this effect, that instead of \$1,100,000 being applicable to the purchase of materials, like machinery and other things, to be worked up in a vocational school, that \$700,000 shall be available for that purpose, and instead of only \$100,000 being available to pay salaries of civilian teachers \$500,000 shall be available for that purpose. Now, the national defense act contem-plated that there should be civilian instructors, and, gentlemen, we might as well be frank about it. Army officers are not by their training nor by their habits of life good instructors in the ordinary branches of education. We will yield to them the palm in the matter of instruction in military discipline and in military efficiency, but when it comes to teaching young men the rudiments of education or the elements of a vocational education they are deficient. There were employed during the current year 625 civilian instructors. No one receives as much as \$6,000. The highest paid teacher or civilian instructor is \$5,700, and only 20 receive more than \$3,000.

My proposition is to leave 10 men there-not 20, as they have now—but to leave 10 men who may get more than \$3,000. For this reason, gentlemen: You can not get a vocational expert, you can not get a man with experience enough nor grasp enough to handle the organization of vocational work of 150,000 men of this great Army for any \$3,000. You can get men in the office who will do the instruction, but you can not get men to sit at some central point like Washington and plan a great instruction organization, see that these instructors do their work, make reports, see that the curriculum prescribed by them is carried out; and I propose to limit this to 10 men who can get more than \$3,000. Now, at the present time they are training officers. A good many civilians have gone in the Regular Establishment, and they are being trained under civilian instructors. They are also training junior officers to be

I never heard of this thing until about a week ago. body suggested it to me-not a single man brought it up. experience alone suggested to me that the limitation of this clause would prove unwise. I find this record, gentlemen, that to-day the 20 men who are receiving more than \$3,000 have organized the work, have trained these junior officers, and they are prepared to hand the work over gradually to the Regular Establishment; but if we cut it down by a single blow there will not be a single man left who can organize and plan the work for the entire Army, and the whole work of vocational training will be discredited and will be broken up, and the \$100,000 will

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Will the gentleman yield? Mr. PARRISH.

Mr. McSWAIN. I will. Mr. PARRISH. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the proviso in lines 5, 6, and 7 on page 44:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries of civilian instructors other than in technical branches.

Does not the gentleman think that proviso would be a limitation that would defeat the purpose of his amendment if it

remains in the bill?

Mr. McSWAIN. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the words "vocational training" imply necessarily a technical education. tional does not imply a literary education, it does not imply an education in geography nor in grammar. defense act contemplated vocational training alone, and I am basing my amendment upon the national defense act. We can not legislate anew. Now, I would like to rewrite in some respects the national defense act, and I expect my friend over there from Vermont [Mr. Greene] would; but we are here appropriating to carry out the national defense act.

Now, then, gentlemen, another thing: Under the present bill \$1,100,000 is appropriated for material, and yet it is for vocational instruction, and I expect every member of this committee has heard it said a hundred times that the best university education any man ever got was Mark Hopkins on one end of a pine puncheon and a receptive and ambitious mind on the other. It is not the brick that makes the house; it is not the piles of books on the shelves that afford an education; it is the teacher. It is the man with zeal in his heart and with experience and training in his makeup that enables him to approach the minds of these boys. So many of them come into the service without the proper educational opportunities. explains the fact that there are so many in the service to-day, my friends, of boys who have not the educational equipment, vocational or otherwise, by which they can compete in the struggle for existence out in the world, and they come into the Army to take the \$30 a month and have the Government furnish them shelter and board. And so these boys during that period of their lives from 18 to 21, and on up, are given an opportunity here to have civilian instructors, who go about it not with the severity and harshness of military discipline but to go about it, as I know they do now, with a sort of fraternal spirit and put their hands on the shoulders of the boy who is fresh from a country home, as a rule, and say, "Look here, my boy, do you not want to come down to our vocational school?" The officer can not do that, and we do not expect him to do it, but these men with zeal in their hearts can do it.

I want to say to you that since I have investigated this matter I have found that the head of this work being conducted in the War Department, the director in charge, is Dr. C. R. Mann, a relative of Horace Mann, of Massachusetts, a pioneer of education in this Republic, and he is giving his service to this Nation without one cent of compensation from the taxpayers. He is being paid by private beneficence that is not costing the Government a single cent.

I think we ought to leave 10 men in this establishment who can receive more than \$3,000 and keep the work organized at the head. We ought have, instead of 625 civilian instructors that we have now, 250, because, as the chairman of the subcommittee will bear me out, each individual instructor costs about \$2,000. And I say that that would be letting it down slowly enough. Let down this matter of civilian instructors in the Military Establishment slowly. And when we shall have done that we will keep our contract with the boys who came into the service under the pledge of this section 27 of the national defense act, that they would receive vocational educa-tion under civilian instructors. That is the pledge of this Government to these boys, and we should keep it. [Applause.]
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, if it were the primary purpose of the Military Establishment toward the young men who deign to enlist-for it has gotten to be about that nowto give all the benefit of experience in expert vocational training, or what is almost the equivalent, perhaps, of a university course in the arts, then the speech made by my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. McSwain] would find an echo in the hearts of a good many men who, like myself, just at present are not convinced by it.

But, as a matter of fact, if one will take pains to inquire into the history of this paragraph that was slipped into the national defense act of June 4, 1916, one will find that at no time in the arguments that were advanced for it in the committee or any where else was there any idea whatever that the thing would ever grow to the proportions that it has assumed since that day. Like many other little adventures that are suggested by people of enlightened imagination, and always with good intentions, it was the hope that some of the idle hours, or hours ordinarily devoted to recreation in a military post, perhaps, might be well employed by teaching such of the young men there as were disposed to go to the classes some of the useful arts, trades, and vocations that were particularly useful to the Army itself, incidentally benefiting the men themselves as a natural consequence. That was the nest egg of the thing.

Then, of course, like every other little proposition of that kind in government, it grew by what it fed upon, as they all do. They all start small, they all start modestly, they all start with the promise of "Cross my heart, hope to die, never shall we ask for anything more." And then pretty soon they begin to show you they have learned so well that they ought to be entitled to a little more appropriation to extend themselves a little farther.

So what has happened to-day is this, and it is little exaggeration, gentlemen: It is almost a question in the Army to-day of whether it is organized for the purpose of national defense or is a kindergarten, and it is pretty well-nigh a question in the Army to-day as to whether an officer, who is supposed to train men, is in command of the soldiers or whether the schoolmaster is running it.

And what we are doing here is the same old story and the same old experience over and over. Little by little this philanthropic, Utopian dream has gotten the better of the hard, practical situation, and we are undertaking to coddle young men with the belief that they can be good soldiers in the ranks by signing up to go to the schoolmaster of an afternoon and pretending to do a little typewriting. Every one of these civilians we take in there-honest gentlemen, unquestionably, and of the high purpose and ideals that schoolmasters usually have, but as schoolmasters frequently demonstrate, not keeping more than one foot on the ground at a time-little by little have begun to insinuate a huge, diversified system of advanced instruction into their curriculum; so that many military men are beside themselves in some places as to whether or not we are going to turn out of that mess, at some time or other, real, red-headed, fighting men, such as armies are supposed to have.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman see that I get an extension of time?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I will ask for it. Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Well, go ahead.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The advertisements that the Army puts out all over the country urging young men to enlist in the Army do accentuate and emphasize the fact that the boys are to get this training, and those advertisements are put out by the Army

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly; I understand that.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. So that the Army officers have no right to get beside themselves, because this is the natural result of the Army propaganda.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes. Mr. DEMPSEY. That is entirely under the statute that the gentleman is condemning at the present time?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes. Mr. HUMPHREYS. It is in the Army?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

I am simply pointing out to you how a little, simple statute, that started with the most innocent-seeming intention in the world, has outgrown the nest that it was planted in and is now almost threatening to overshadow the military activities of the Military Establishment. And no matter what some theorist may tell you, it is seriously interfering with the morale and with the discipline and the general purpose of military

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question? I will certainly cooperate in getting him an extension of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont

has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. ANTHONY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes. Is there objec-

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In the first place, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if you were taken individually where you confessed things to yourselves, you and I know, and everyone of us would agree, that the purpose of giving a grammar-school education, or anything like it or beyond it, does not appertain to anything belonging to the constitutional functions of the Federal Government. We know it, and we know that our fathers would never have thought of such a thing.

Mr. MADDEN. Particularly through the Army.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Certainly. We know that that is the function of the States, and we know that by this means and otherwise we are gradually usurping the functions of the States and planting them down here in the bureaus of Washington. [Applause.] Some of us talk against it and pretend we are not doing it, but everything of this kind that comes up shows that we do do it.

Here is another suggestion: All throughout last week gentle-men got up on this floor, good-intentioned, patriotic, and highminded colleagues of mine-and I am not making personal allusions, and do not intend to-denounced the Army and the awful extravagance inseparable from militarism. For the last several years, whenever I got the floor, I have made a practice of trying to point out, as other gentlemen have done, the mistake that is being made in this respect. I have tried to make a study of this thing, and I find that the grand total cost of the Army, the expense of maintaining the Army, is swelled by just such things as my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. McSwain] has advocated in his amendment.

The gentlemen divide the total expense of the Army by the number of soldiers in the Army and thus calculate that the per capita cost of the Army per soldier is such and such, whereas the legitimate cost of maintaining a capable army is not represented by the grand total of expense as we have it at all. Then gentlemen insist that the only way to obtain economy is to cut off the number of soldiers without looking to the numbers required for tactical formations or the plain, practical necessities of a training army. They would just slice off a few thousand soldiers at one end of the Army Establishment and let go unchallenged and unmolested at the other end all these extraneous and extravagant misplaced ideas of society that are harbored in the War Department. That is what you are do-[Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Can the gentleman give us any information as to the percentage of civilians in the Army in proportion to

the percentage of real military people engaged in it?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not know what the percentages are, but I know that little by little, with these beautiful cambric-tea fashions that are now getting into vogue, this fluffy-duff, powder-puff conglomeration of fads and specialties, the red-headed, deep-chested, husky fighting man will be routed out of the Army

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In a moment. organized for the purpose of training and fighting, not for the purpose of going to school. If the States and society do not give education to the youth of the land as they should, where it belongs, let us transfer the remedy to afflicted patients in places where the disease has been contracted and not make a great national educational hospital out of the Military Establishment. [Laughter.]

The Army has not been organized for the purpose of taking away the educational functions that belong to the States.

When you hear gentlemen exploiting their ideas of economy about the Army-many of which even a swaggering, swashbuckling militarist such as I am charged with being must approve-it is well to think that one can not stand up here and propose to cut off 2,000 or 20,000 men from the Army and say that is true economy, when all the while you can reach inside the organization of the establishment and pluck out some of these unnecessary and fanciful activities which are confused by some with what is called "militarism," but which are not militarism but just pure piffle. [Applause.] No reasonable man stands but just pure piffle. [Applause.] No reasonable man stands against the use of the spelling book and all the rest of it where they belong, and I know that you and I believe in the spelling book when it is in its place. But when war is on and a national defense proposition is up we do not run to the school-

You gentlemen may remember that in the war this same dilettante idea was originated of making a kind of a soldier who would not kill anybody. It was then called the Students' Army Training Corps. Well, in the midst of it I remember how, in discussing the Students' Army Training Corps, our old friend Abe Martin sent broadcast throughout the land this statement: "Lemmie Peters has been ketched in the draft, and will take rhetoric and botany." [Laughter.]

That is just exactly what we are breeding now.

Perhaps my language may seem to be a little bit extravagant. and I do not mean to characterize this business unfairly. But I still entertain the old-fashioned idea that the Army was organized principally to kill somebody, if awful necessity demanded, or to keep itself from being killed. And I still think that when we begin to cross these activities of Government, and more particularly-and this is the solemn side of it, neighbors-when we come in through one pretense or another trying to deceive ourselves at the time, taking out the activities in the States and putting them down here somewhere in this city, or else taking away the functions that the home governments ought to exercise for themselves and tucking them away here in a bureau in Washington, letting this Federal Government do for society what society ought to do for itself back home where it lives, then the dream of the founders of our Government that the Government should come from the people up is gone.

We are every day or so in this council Chamber picking up our Government or plucking it up by the roots to see if it has grown any yet. [Laughter.] By and by there will be no government growing back home, because everything has been moved down here, either at this end of the Avenue or at the

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not think we can improve the Army by the methods of the ouija board?
Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont

has again expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee one question. How much is carried in this item as compared with what was carried in the bill that passed before?

Mr. ANTHONY. There was \$1,500,000 appropriated for that purpose in the last bill. The department asked for \$5,000,000. Mr. WALSH. Well, there is a reduction in the item below

what the department asks,

Mr. ANTHONY. That was done on the recommendation of the Secretary of War, who felt he could still further reduce the \$1,500,000 that we agreed on in conference to the amount

carried in this bill, \$1,200,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to know that there has been a reduction in this item. I have expressed myself rather vigorously on this matter when it has been up before, in opposition to our continuing this particular activity. informed by some of the boys who are the presumed beneficiaries of this training that it is called educational and recreational, and in the ranks they term it E. and R.—eat and rest. They are taught how to be tinkers and harness makers and typewriters and artists and various other activities under

the guise of military training.

I think the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] on a previous occasion pointed out that in one or two of the camps the boys were particularly informed that their military instruction and duties would not in any way interfere with their educational work; that the officers would see to it that their educational and recreational work during the afternoon would not be at all interfered with. Now, when I have heard of the horrible condition in which some of these young men are, I have almost wondered how they ever managed to render such valiant service during the late war, and it is interesting to note the acclaim and the propaganda in behalf of these worthy civilian instructors, some of whom probably are on a par with the civilian instructors who undertook the administration of the activities of the Vocational Rehabilitation Bureau. Some of those broken-down antiquated instructors who were in need of some rehabilitation themselves are some of the men who are very much interested in this particular work; and I have no doubt that they would be glad if the salaries were increased and perhaps the number made fewer. But it seems to me that if we are to return to a normal basis in the Army, to prepare for another conflict, the first thing we ought to do is to get an Army together that will be prepared to wage war, and not encourage these men who get into the Army not to reenlist by fitting them to take up the work of some other activity, such as electrician or harness maker or something like that. If you fit them for that work, you can not expect them to reenlist in !

the Army and to help make up the rank of the Army and to become proficient and expert along military lines. I am very glad to receive the information from the chairman of the subcommittee that the appropriation has been reduced below the estimates. I wish they had made a greater reduction. I hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSwain].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. Stafford having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Tilson, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the Army appropriation bill, H. R. 5010, had come to no resolution thereon.

REQUEST TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on post-office matters

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, what is the subject of the remarks which the gentleman desires to extend?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is a discussion of the question of presidential postmasters.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman propose in his extension of remarks to inform the House what the policy of the Post Office Department is going to be on that subject?

Mr. THOMPSON. The gentleman proposes to discuss it from

his own standpoint and his own information.

Mr. WINGO. Unless the gentleman can give us a statement of the judgment of the department as to what it is going to do, I fear it might cause friction in the gentleman's party and cause discussion, and I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio

objects.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask for time to address the House to-morrow morning on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to address the House to-morrow after the read-

ing of the Journal. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman should state what length of

time he requests.

Mr. THOMPSON. About 20 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall have to object.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming objects.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE-BOGY V. HAWES.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Stafford in the chair). The Chair lays before the House a communication from the Clerk, transmitting certain papers in the contested-election case of Bernard P. Bogy against Harry B. Hawes, eleventh district of Missouri, which, without objection, will be referred to Committee on Elections No. 1.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, what is it that it is proposed

to refer?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Certain papers received by the Clerk in the election contest of Bogy against Hawes, which the Chair has referred to Committee on Elections No. 1.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 10, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

108. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of claims amounting to \$610,982.88 allowed by accounting officers of the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be

109. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill to remove from State courts to Federal courts of cases in which the Government is the real party in

interest; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

110. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$600,000 required by the War Department for the water system at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, fiscal year 1922 (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

111. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmit-ting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,000 required for the relief of the estate of Joseph Mathews, of Solvay, N. Y., for loss of a Liberty bond (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committees on Appropriations and Claims and ordered to be

printed.

112. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a paragraph of legislation authorizing a transfer between subheads of the appropriation "Coast Guard, 1921" (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be

printed.

113. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmit-ting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War of the 4th instant, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the sum of \$500, required by the War Department for salaries, office of the Secretary of War, fiscal year 1922 (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

114. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Navy of the 3d instant, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the sum of \$25,000, required by the Navy Department for an historical pictorial record of the American Fleet in foreign waters (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Appro-

priations and ordered to be printed. 115. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to \$17,579.46, which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Appropriations

and ordered to be printed.

116. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of claims (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

117. A communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting contested-election case of Bernard P. Bogy v. Harry B. Hawes, from the eleventh congressional district of Missouri (H. Doc. No. 79); to the Committee on Elections No. 1 and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Inter-state and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4091) granting the consent of Congress to the Borderland Coal Corporation to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in Mingo County, W. Va., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 54), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOWNER, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5756) to amend an act entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for these islands," approved August 29, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 55), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. A. P. NELSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 94) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate depositaries of public moneys in foreign countries and in the Territories and insular possessions of the United States, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 56), which said bill and report were referred to the House

Mr. SWEET, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) authorizing and directing the accounting officers of the Treasury to allow credit to the disbursing clerk of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in certain cases, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 57), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Mr. BARBOUR, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5223) to exempt from cancellation certain desert-land entries in Riverside County, Calif., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 58), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHINDBLOM, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 7) to amend section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the operation of Government-owned radio stations for the use of the general public, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1920, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 59), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5259) for the relief of the heirs at law of A. Barker; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

A bill (H. R. 5868) granting a pension to Hugh G. Smelcer; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS,

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials

were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 5938) to provide for the acquisition, ownership, and operation by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of all the street railroads located in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of

Columbia.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 5939) providing for the deportation of certain aliens who withdrew their declaration of in-tention to become citizens of the United States in order to escape military service; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 5940) to amend the Federal reserve act by making the Secretary of Agriculture an ex officio member of the Federal Reserve Board; to the Committee on

Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5941) to transfer from time to time the interest and profits earned by the Federal reserve banks to the Federal Farm Loan Board; to the Committee on Banking and

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 5942) to establish a mint of the United States in the city of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 5943) to validate certain allot-ments of land made to Indians on the Lac Courte Oreille Indian

Reservation in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs. By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5944) for the erection of a public building at Russellville, Logan County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5945) for the erection of a public building at Central City, Muhlenberg County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5946) for the erection of a public building

at Franklin, Simpson County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5947) for the erection of a public building at Greenville, Muhlenberg County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5948) for the erection of a public building at Scottsville, Allen County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5949) to establish a sanctuary or sanctuaries for game animals and for birds and fish in the national forest reservation, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 5950) to increase the percentage of national forest receipts to be paid to the Territory

of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5951) to create an Alaska fish commission, to define its powers and duties, and to provide for the protection, conservation, and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries

By Mr. JEFFERIS: A bill (H. R. 5952) to repeal section 852, chapter 16, and the first paragraph of section 848, chapter 16, Revised Statutes of the United States, and to amend the

first paragraph of page 377, chapter 200, volume 35, part 1, United States Statutes at Large, first session of the Sixtieth Congress, by striking out the words "in the States of Wyoming, Montana, Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Idaho, Colorado, Utah, and in the Territories of New Mexico and Ariona"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 5953) to amend the

law respecting sales of national forest timber; to the Com-

mittee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5954) to establish a sanctuary or sanctuaries for game animals and for birds and fish in the national forest reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WARD of New York: A bill (H. R. 6033) for the

relief of officers on retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on

Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to provide for the coinage of peace dollars; to the Committee on Coinage,

Weights, and Measures,

By Mr. GOULD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to employees of the United States Department of Agriculture who died in the War with Germany; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CANNON: Resolution (H. Res. 84) providing for

additional compensation for enrolling clerk; to the Committee on

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Resolution (H. Res. 85) to allow the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department to appoint a clerk to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, regarding the Japanese question in California; to the

Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California relative to the tariff on olives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California relative to the protection of the almond industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 5955) for the relief of A. M. Simons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENHAM: A bill (H. R. 5956) granting a pension to Edith C. Rowlison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5957) granting a pension to Jeremiah M. McNew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5958) granting a pension to Jordan Kidwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5959) granting an increase of pension to Evaline Weekley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 5960) to reimburse Commander Walter H. Allen, civil engineer, United States Navy, for losses sustained while carrying out his duties; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 5961) for the relief of

Charles B. Malpas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H, R. 5962) granting a pension to William Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

Also, a bill (H. R. 5963) granting a pension to Mary C. Whalen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 5964) changing the naval record of Clarence A. Richards for the administration of the

pension laws; to the Committee on Naval Affairs. By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 5965) for the relief of the owner of the vessel Maria Artau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 5966) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Northfield, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUNBAR; A bill (H. R. 5967) granting a pension to Rebecca Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5968) for the relief of Maud Sheffey; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 5969) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Ohio State Archæological and Historical Society one German airplane; to the Committee on Military

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 5970) for the relief of Philip-Hager; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 5971) for the relief of

Floyd Irving Lattin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFERIS: A bill (H. R. 5972) authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to pay Henry Iske, La Platte, Nebr., the sum of \$2,110.64, for cattle unlawfully condemned; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5973) authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to pay Henry F. Meyers the sum of \$785,10 as full compensation for services rendered as a member of local draft board No. 1, Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Claims. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 5974) for the

relief of Charles H. Reed; to the Committee on Military Af-

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 5975) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Camp Point, State of Illinois, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Af-

Also, a bill (H. R. 5976) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mendon, State of Illinois, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5977) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Golden, State of Illinois, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5978) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Payson, State of Illinois, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 5979) for the relief of

Alexander Carlino; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLSPAUGH: A bill (H. R. 5980) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of La Grange, State of Missouri, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on. Military Affairs, By Mr. NOLAN; A bill (H. R. 5981) for the relief of the Rolph

Navigation & Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 5982) for the examination and survey of the Bayou St. John, State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 5983) granting an increase of pension to George Foos; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER: A bill (H. R. 5984) for the relief of Samuel Friedman, as trustee for the heirs and devisees of B. Friedman and Henry Mills, and as trustee for the heirs and devisees of

Emanuel Loveman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 5985) for the relief of the legal representative of Nathaniel F. Cheairs, deceased; to the

Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5986) for the relief of the Ancona Printing Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REBER: A bill (H. R. 5987) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orwin, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5988) granting an increase of pension to George Milams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5989) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gatlinburg, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5990) authorizing the Secretary of War to

donate to the city of Jonesboro, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5991) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Butler, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5992) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bristol, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5993) granting a pension to Mont Musgrave; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 5994) granting a pension to Jane Loring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5995) granting a pension to Frances Melcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION: A bill (H. R. 5996) granting a pension to Jasper N. Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5997) granting a pension to Herbert G. Hoots: to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5998) granting a pension to John W. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5999) granting a pension to Eliza P. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6000) granting an increase of pension to Judah Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6001) for the relief of John W. Hardwick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6002) granting a pension to Otis Stout; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr, ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 6003) granting an increase

of pension to Angus J. MacDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 6004) authorizing the President to appoint James G. C. Salyers to the position and rank of captain of Coast Artillery Corps in the United States Army;

to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 6005) granting a pension to Frank P. Lilley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS: A bill (H. R. 6006) for the relief of the owners of the steamboat Henry M. Stanley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6007) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Sitzer; to the Committee on Invalid

Also, a bill (H. R. 6008) granting a pension to Emma Cornelia Troy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 6009) for the relief of

Charles Springer; to the Committee on Military Affairs. By Mr. TYSON: A bill (H. R. 6010) providing for the purchase of a site to be used for the erection of a public building thereon at Camden, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 6011) granting a pension to Catherine Rugg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARD of New York: A bill (H. R. 6012) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870 (16th Stat. L., p. 670), authorizing the Postmaster General to continue to use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined post-marking and stamp-canceling hand-stamp patents, and directing him to "determine upon a fair, just, and equitable compensation for the use of said invention," or arising otherwise; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 6013) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ligonier, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee

on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6014) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Trafford, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6015) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of North Belle Vernon, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6016) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Alexandria, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6017) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Newton, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military

Also, a bill (H. R. 6018) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Florence, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6019) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Irwin, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military

Also, a bill (H. R. 6020) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Arnold, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6021) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Parnassus, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military

Also, a bill (H. R. 6022) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Kensington, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military

Also, a bill (H. R. 6023) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Scottdale, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military

Also, a bill (H. R. 6024) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Robert G. Kotouch Post, No. 318, Greensburg, State

of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6025) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of East Vandergrift, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6026) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mount Pleasant, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military

Also, a bill (H. R. 6027) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Latrobe, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6028) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Adamsburg, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6029) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Avonmore, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6030) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Vandergrift, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military

Also, a bill (H. R. 6031) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Jeannette, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6032) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Monessen, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

543. By the SPEAKER (by request): Papers to accompany House bill 5891; to the Committee no Claims.

544. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition of the Toledo Chamber of Commerce, urging favorable action on the legislative program of the American Legion for relief of ex-service men; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

545. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Henry E. Kelley Post, No. 45, American Legion, Elkhorn; Racine Principals' Forum, of Racine; Beloit Chamber of Commerce, of Beloit; and Women's Auxiliary, Edwin L. Jones Post, No. 91, American Legion, of Oconomowoc, all in the State of Wisconsin, urging relief of disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

546. Also, petition of Jerome Bergerson and other residents of Racine, Wis., in favor of beer and light wines and against Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

547. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of the Wakefield (Mass.), Council, Knights of Columbus, favoring relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

548. Also, petition of the Pilgrim Publicity Association (Inc.), indorsing the principle of dyestuff protection, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

549. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Celtic Association, South Boston, Mass., Thomas A. McGrath, secretary, urging the passage of laws which will accord American ships the right of passage free of toll through the Panama Canal without similar privilege being accorded to foreign ships; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

550. By Mr. HAYS: Petition by 164 citizens of Ava, Douglas County, Mo., urging the President to call a conference of the great powers to consider military disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

551. Also, petition of Appleton Brewery & Ice Co., of Old Appleton, Mo., for repeal of internal-revenue tax on cereal beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

552. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Mr. Thomas S. Armstrong and other citizens urging the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

553. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of St. Paul Post, No. 8, American Legion, urging relief for the disabled soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

554. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Pitcairn, Pa., urging amnesty for all political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

555. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C., relative to highways, etc.; to the Committee on Roads.

556. Also, petition of W. Burton & Co., New York, N. Y., relative to certain sections of House bill 5033; to the Commit-

tee on the Judiciary.

557. Also, petition of William Gregg, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

558. Also, petition of Milner Bros. (Inc.), Brooklyn, N. Y., urging duty on greeting cards, etc.; to the Committee on Ways

559. By Mr. MALONEY: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Lawrence, Mass., against the use by France of colored troops in the occupied districts of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

560. Also, petition of the Council Ste. Victoire, South Lawrence, Mass., and Council Jacques Cartier, Lynn, Mass., against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee

on Education.

561. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Federal Employees' Union No. 1, National Federation of Federal Employees, of San Francisco, urging support of House bill 2429; to the Committee on Labor. Letter from World Metric Standardization Council, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing House bill 10; to the Committee on Weights and Measures. Telegram from Automobile Club of Southern California, indorsing Senate bill 1072; to the Committee on Roads. Telegram from Division No. 415, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Roseville, Calif., against any sales or turnover tax, and indorsing progressive taxation of large incomes, estates, and excess profits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

562. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Association of Commerce, Minot, N. Dak., and Argonne Post, No. 85, of the American Legion, Beulah, N. Dak., urging the passage of legislation for the relief of disabled service men; to the Committee on

Ways and Means.

563. Also, concurrent resolution by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, petitioning Congress to request the Joint International Commission to call a conference for the purpose of taking action for the control of the floods of the Red River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

564. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of the Utica, N. Y., Trades Assembly, indorsing relief for the disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

565. By Mr. TEMPLE: Resolution of the Board of Education of the Fallowfield School District, Washington County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

566. Also, petition of the McKenna Brass & Manufacturing Co. (Inc.), Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the enactment of House bill 4981; to the Committee on Agriculture.

567. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of Clayton J. Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

568. Also, petition of Rudolph W. Battershell, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the

Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. 569. Also, petition of Maurice M. Daniels, Hicksville, Ohio,

urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the

Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. 570. Also, petition of Samuel B. Deardorff, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the

Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. 571. Also, petition of Vernon G. Killian, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the

Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. 572. Also, petition of W. C. Wreght, Hicksville, Ohio, urging increased compensation for rural letter carriers; to the Com-

mittee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

573. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the Bay State Division, No. 413, Order of Railway Conductors, urging the repeal of the excess-profit tax, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

574. Also, petition of citizens of Roxbury and Boston, Mass., urging the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs,

575. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of the Westfield, Mass., Medical Society, against the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

576. By Mr. VARE: Petition of annual convention Episcopal Church, asking for international agreement for disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 10, 1921.

(Legislative day of Monday, May 9, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of

Mr. PENROSE, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball McLean McNary Shortridge Borah Harreld Harris Harrison Heffin Simmons Smith Smoot Stanfield Broussard Bursum Calder Moses Nelson Nelson New Newberry Nicholson Norbeck Norris Oddie Overman Penrose Johnson Jones, N. Mex. Jones, Wash. Cameron Sterling Sutherland Capper Caraway Townsend Kellogg Kendrick Kenyon Trammell Wadsworth Walsh, Mass. Walsh, Mont. Culberson Cummins Curtis Kenyon Keyes King Knox Ladd La Follette Lenroot McCormick McCumber McKellar McKinley Penrose Phipps Pittman Poindexter Pomerene Ransdell Reed Robinson Warren Watson, Ga. Watson, Ind. Diel Edge Ernst Fernald Fletcher Williams Willis Wolcott France Frelinghuysen Gooding

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. Underwood] is unavoidably absent on account of a death in his family. I ask that this

announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HARRIS presented a resolution of the Savannah Paint Club, of Savannah, Ga., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Harrison naval stores bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Georgia, remonstrating against any revision of the tariff on those classes of coal-tar products that are used in the manufacture of dips and disinfectants, etc., generally used by farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WARREN presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Chicago Hide, Fur & Wool House (Inc.), of Douglas, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation imposing a protective tariff on wool and wool products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Marietta, Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1073, for the relief of Lewis Clarke Lucas (now a lieutenant colonel on the retired list of the Marine Corps), and placing him on the active list in the grade of colonel, to take rank next after Theodore Porter Kane, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a resolution adopted by the Adjutants General Association of the United States, in special session at Washington, D. C., en March 15, 1921, favoring the enactment of legislation amending certain sections of national defense act, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, pertaining to the National Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions of Local No. 2042, Bellview Farmers' Union, of Kincald, and Local No. 843, Farmers' Union, of Marysville, Kans., protesting against the enactment of legislation repealing the excess-profits tax law and substituting therefor a sales or turnover tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions of Auxiliary Post No. 203, American Legion, of Montezuma, and Earl C. Gormley Post, No. 45, American Legion, of Junction City, both in the State of Kansas, favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate relief for disabled ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Shiawassee County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Perry, Mich., praying for the enactment of the so-called Volstead supplemental prohibition enforcement bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

He also presented resolutions of auxiliary of Carl O. Weaver Post, No. 194, of Petoskey; Council No. 389, Knights of Colum-